UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 04331 3451

262.5
N

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

AS DEFINED BY THE

COUNCIL OF TRENT:

EXPOUNDED IN

A SERIES OF CONFERENCES DELIVERED IN GENEVA.

BY THE REV. A. NAMPON, S.J.

PROPOSED AS A MEANS OF REUNITING ALL CHRISTIANS.

Translated from the French, with the approbation of the Author, by a member of the University of Oxford.

EX LIBRIS
BASIL'S SCHOLASTICA
No. $ 3578 TR
9/17/
A.F. Sinnard
10.19.'89

PHILADELPHIA:
PETER F. CUNNINGHAM & SON, CATHOLIC BOOKSELLERS,
No. 817 Arch Street.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE TORONTO
LIBRARY

INTRODUCTION

BY THE

AMERICAN PUBLISHER.

THE work, which we here introduce to the American public, translated from the French by an Oxford Convert, who owes his conversion to its perusal, is of so much importance at this particular time and so full of intrinsic value, that we cannot allow it to go forth without saying something regarding it. That the author should have ventured to speak in this manner on such a subject in the stronghold of Calvinism, is a religious phenomenon, well calculated to excite wonder. Once the overruling authority of Calvin was so great in the city of Geneva, that, as is well known from history, none had ever dared with impunity give utterance to a doctrine, that contradicted in the least particular the favored teaching of the heresiarch. Servetus had paid in his own blood the penalty of his rashness in broaching a new scheme of Theology. Many others had found in the darkness of the dungeon and the cruelty of the elders of Presbyterianism, that a tyranny had thrown its chains around them, far worse than any, they had ever imagined, threatened them from Rome. How did this power cease to exert its violence! How did the despotic vigilance, which had held consciences so long captive, cease to pry into the privacy of the family or turn away careless from such open defiance of its Argus-eyed policy? What could have lulled its suspicion of Roman interference or induced it to allow a Roman Catholic bishop or worse, a Jesuit priest to enter within its walls and openly proclaim the

teachings of that Council, which it had always been heretofore their special delight to decry and defame? Ah! it is written: "Unless the Lord doth build the house, the builders work in vain. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it." Ps. cxxvi. 1 and 2. Our author shows the cause in the essential character of error, which condemned by God, could no more than the fig-tree, accursed by the Saviour, retain for any great length of time even the semblance of life. It is the usual fate of every thing that has its origin in the depraved passions of men. Every thing that rises in rebellion against the laws and rights of truth must have but a transitory existence. And then, error begets error and revolt against revelation must always and infallibly produce revolt against reason, which soon finds its natural level in indifference and infidelity. So has it been with Geneva. Indifference and infidelity have obtained such a power over the chiefs of the sect, that Servetus' spirit, if it could rejoice, would exult and triumph in the spectacle now presented to the mind in the very place, where the stake was the only answer to his arguments, which only carried Calvin's principles to their natural conclusion. Meanwhile that religion, against whose so-called abominations Calvin and his followers protested so strenuously, has been using its immortal privileges and gradually extending its influence and captivating the restless and unsatisfied minds of its opponents by the solid and consoling truths, it offers to man in all his necessities. The Catholic Church in Geneva is now so strongly rooted, that no human force can move it. And this series of conferences in the capital city of Presbyterianism on a subject once so detested by the Reformers is a proof of the assertion.

At a time too when all minds are looking anxiously forward to the approaching Council, this study of the last General Council of Trent seems most appropriate. For the Catholic indeed there is but little necessity of such

conferences. His faith knows on whom it rests. And therefore he can say with the Apostle: I know whom I have believed and I am certain that He is able to keep that which I have committed to Him." 2 Tim. i. 12. No wonder then that "the God of hope fills him with all joy and peace in believing." Rom. xv. 13. A laudable curiosity however he may entertain, for who does not love to contemplate the workings of the Holy Spirit upon earth and to enjoy the delight of a better comprehension of His infinite love manifested in working out the salvation of man? But beyond this the Catholic knows, that the Spirit of Truth abides with the Apostles of the Saviour and he has no fear nor anxiety about the result. To him that blessed Spirit will speak by the mouth of His Vicar on earth and whatever doubt he may have had before on questions, that were still debateable, will disappear under the brightness of the Faith evolved in the words of Pius IX. To him this work will however be full of interest and consolation: of interest, because it gives a history of the last three centuries of trial and combat in what should most excite the curiosity of a rational being, that is, in the confirmation of revealed truth and the condemnation of error: of consolation, because it shows him, although indirectly, how blessed a thing it is for him to trust God's word and give himself unreservedly to the guidance of divine providence.

But to the Protestant, and especially to the American Protestant, no matter what his denomination, this book conveys a serious meaning. He will see in it, how the human mind, which he delights to elevate so high, falls from its "high estate" and grovels in the lowest depths of degradation, as soon as it wanders away from the abode of revealed truth and attempts to substitute its own vagaries for the doctrines, with which kind heaven has blest the earth. The Protestant delights to bring every thing to the test of his human reason. It is his great boast that he is guided by reason and "swears not to the

words of any master." And yet that reason, puffed up with a high idea of its own importance, even in matters altogether beyond its ken, refuses the light of God's sanctuary, wanders away amid the mazes of interminable error, until blinded and maimed it becomes an object of compassionate wonder to all that behold it. Who that considers the thousand and one tales, which the Reformation tells in this our enlightened Protestant nation to all its followers, and compares them with the first teachings of the Lutheran and Calvinistic rebellion, will not be forced to admit that human reason can descend no lower; that the degradation of religious principle is complete? And this is the legitimate and necessary consequence of a separation from the One fold and the One Shepherd. So true is it that "those on whom this stone shall fall, it shall grind into powder:" Matt. xxi. 44, to be scattered to the four winds of heaven. Ah! would that my countrymen would see and understand; would receive the warning in time and take refuge from their false teachers and much more from their own self-love and pride of intellect in that ark of salvation, in which alone they can find safety and honor. Our country prides itself on its untrammelled liberty and in nothing has this pride shown itself more perfectly than in the freedom every man has of making a religion for himself and serving God, as the phrase goes, according to the dictates of his own conscience. Most of those restraints, which fettered and still partially fetter the followers of the Reformation in Europe, are here unknown or are despised, as unworthy of present freedom and civilization. Protestantism therefore has had a freer field and a wider scope for showing the peculiar nature of its aspirations. It has had every thing to help it. And what has been the result of this independence? So many new and contradictory methods of contributing to the advancement of the soul in the ways of God: so many new spiritual patents issued for the amelioration of the human race: so many bewildering

devices for bringing heaven down to earth or raising earth to heaven and uniting man more closely with God: all ending in further estrangement even from that which is man's glory, his rational nature. Is not this variety, this multiplicity of sects "the powder," into which the Reformation is crushed by the corner-stone of Truth, which has fallen upon it? Such bewildering contradictions cannot certainly emanate from Him, who is the One True God, who has established here on earth "His pillar and ground" of Truth in the *one* fold, watched over by His *one* shepherd.

The statement of the revealed Truth, as defined and explained by the Fathers of Trent, compared with the opposite dogmatizing of the various leaders of the Reformation cannot but make a deep impression on every right-thinking mind. However strong prejudice *may be* in biassing the judgment, the contrast in this juxta-position of the two must result in destroying all the virulence of error and establishing the right of the truth to our devotion and love. Could we hope that our dissenting brethren would read this book, as the translator did, with a prayerful and sincere desire of knowing what is right, we would be sure that no long time would intervene between their reading and the grateful homage they would give to God for the mercy that removes the veil from their eyes and permits them to see the beauty, aye and the divinity of His holy church. As so many others have already felt and gratefully acknowledged the benefit, their souls have derived from even slighter glimpses of truth in the Church, so those who read this work cannot but perceive the harmony, that reigns in all her teachings, from the most elevated dogmas to her simplest practices. It was this that brought the translator into the Church and this satisfaction of reason will be the source of ineffable light, whereby they also may discover the hidden sweetness, the celestial manna, for which their soul sighs in vain under the dry and dead offering of their own

profession. If any spark of divine faith yet remains in their souls, crushed though it be under the ashes and cinders of human observances, it must be nourished into a fire and a flame by the fuel thus supplied. Ah! may He "who came to send fire on the earth and wishes nothing so much as that it be enkindled," send into those hearts the breath of "His spirit, and renew the face of the earth," on which they dwell, by the celestial light, that beams from His throne. They will then *know* that "the Catholic Church is the only one that retains the true worship of God. This is the source of truth; this is the abode of faith; this the temple of God. Whoever does not enter this, or whoever leaves it, leaves all hope of eternal life and salvation. None should deceive himself by obstinately contesting its rights. For life and salvation are at stake: unless he attend to these with due caution and diligence, he is lost." Lact. Div. Ins. l. 4. With these words of the eloquent Lactantius we commend most earnestly this book to the lovers of truth among the American people.

NOTE.—It is necessary to remark that the author in speaking of the present condition of Protestantism, has chiefly in view France. Switzerland, and Germany. Things have not gone so far in this country, though we fear they are rapidly tending in that direction. We have deemed this remark necessary to prevent the author being charged with exaggeration.

It is well to state also that the translation here published, was prepared under the eye of the author and by him sent to this country, for publication. Some additions and omissions which we have noticed, must thus be considered as made by the author himself, and not unauthorized changes by the translator.

INTRODUCTION.

THAT I may be better understood by my readers, and may anticipate the reproach of temerity which they might naturally bring against me, I shall here explain the occasion and the object of this work, the method I have followed, the use which may be made of it, and the fruits which it ought to produce.

Undoubtedly the Exposition of Bossuet will always be sufficient for making the Catholic Doctrine known and appreciated both by friends and enemies. It is a masterpiece of clearness and precision which no one can pretend to supersede. But since the end of the seventeenth century, how many new variations and divisions have appeared among Protestants! What ruins has the explosion of rationalism scattered on that desolated plain! and what weakness has been produced in that which yet remains among them of Christian belief! How many doctrines, at that time respected, are now thrown aside with contempt in the exercise of private judgment! How much has the authority of Scripture been shaken! To what an extent have the sublime mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and, indeed, all mystery, all notions of the Supernatural, become, in the eyes of an ever-increasing number of those who heretofore were Christians, superannuated, absurd, mythological ideas? Something therefore has to be added to the work of the Bishop of Meaux. I am not guilty of entertaining this bold idea. I should justly have incurred the blame merited by the Continuator of the Discourse on Universal History. Despairing success in following his method, I have been obliged to endeavor to work on a different plan.

In translating the Council of Trent, I have translated

an exposition of the Catholic Faith, indisputably more perfect than that of Bossuet, and of which the author is the Church itself, assisted by the Holy Ghost. It is impossible for these definitions, impressed with the seal of divine authority and truth, to become more widely known, without producing the salutary effects which the Fathers of Trent had in view: that is to say, confirming Catholics in the faith and dissipating the prejudices, doubts and errors of a great number of those who differ from us. That the beauty of our rites may be appreciated, I have presented what is better than the fictions of the most beautiful poetry, some pages faithfully translated from the Ritual and Pontifical. I have added the profession of faith of Pius IV., with the notes of the theological faculty of Louvain, which has distinguished itself in its contests against heresy.

The anathemas directed by the Council against those who attack our dogmas could not have been included in this work, if I had not made some mention of the errors of those teachers. I have therefore rapidly traced their genealogy, a task made easy for me by the labors of Bellarmine, Bossuet, Moëhler, Döllinger, and others. At the same time I have spoken as little as possible of them, because such an enumeration, which could never be complete, and must always be disagreeable, would have been useful but to a small number, and repugnant to most, and would have transformed into a polemical treatise an exposition which I wished especially to make clear, brief, and kindly.

Composed of such elements, the work will, I hope, be of some use, first to Catholics who wish to have a more than elementary knowledge of our doctrines, than to Protestants who are desirous of not protesting against the Council of Trent without being acquainted with the

subject, and to those especially who wish to have done with this unhappy protesting.

The parallel which it exhibits, on all the points in controversy, between the majestic unchangeableness of our doctrines, and the incessant fluctuation, the short duration, the rapid passing away of the systems opposed to us, is of itself alone a demonstration of the divine institution of our Church. We shall see this proof reproduced in every chapter of the book. This is the place in which to present it as a whole, and in a summary manner.

Our Saviour said to His disciples: "The man who comes to me, and hears my words and practices them is like one who when he is going to build a house digs deep into the ground, and succeeds in establishing its foundations on the rock. Afterwards comes a flood, but its waves only break against the building which remains unshaken, being grounded on the rock. On the contrary, he who hears my teaching and does not put it in practice, is like a man who makes himself a dwelling upon the sand without foundations. The waters beat against it, and at the first shock it falls and becomes a great ruin."[1]

According to these words of Jesus Christ, the Church which appears ever immoveable amid the storms, with faith unshaken, notwithstanding the unceasingly renewed assaults of hell and of time, is established upon a solid foundation, and is the shelter of those who come to Jesus Christ, that is of true Christians.

On the contrary, if you see that the mere course of time draws a religious society into a whirlpool of variations and of divisions without end, you may say with confidence: "This was only a sect without internal consistency and without any authority founded on divine institution; they who composed it were not the chosen of God."

This principle being admitted, let us see what has passed in the world, since that deplorable schism which

[1] Luc. vi. 46; Matth. vii. 24.

called itself *the Reformation.* A general council convoked by the supreme authority, which up to that time had been obeyed in the Church, assembles, deliberates, discusses in complete freedom the points of doctrine attacked by the innovators and defines that, according to Scripture, the Fathers and the preceding Councils such and such are the doctrines to be believed, the rules of morals to be followed, the sacraments to be received, the form of worship to be celebrated. Since that time, has the little volume, entitled "*The Canons and Decrees of the Holy Council of Trent,*" lost anything of its authority in the Catholic Church? Can it be said that the faith which it sets forth is nothing but a memory of the past? that owing to the light which three centuries of controversy have thrown on the points in dispute, certain opinions which had been too hastily raised into dogmas have been given up? Just the contrary. There is not one of our eight hundred bishops who does not at this day voluntarily subscribe all the decisions of the Council just as it was done two or three centuries ago; not a theologian who does not take its decrees as the certain and absolute rule of his teaching; not an iota changed, not a point retracted. Had the Council been promulgated yesterday it would not have had for us a greater present reality. Had its anathemas been written in so many letters in the Gospel, they would not have been in our eyes more definitive, more worthy of perfect obedience.

Here is certainly a solid structure, which resists the variations of philosophical systems, the persecutions of the ungodly, the revolutions of empires, the attacks of interest, of prejudice, of passion, the dissolving labors of criticism, the progress of physical, historical and other science, the unrestrained love of novelty, the abuses which undermine sometime or other the most firmly established human institutions; and when we consider that the Council of Trent only confirmed the decrees of previous Councils, and at its opening declared that it had no symbol of

faith but those of Nice and of the Apostles, at the sight of foundations so deep, so well settled on the rock, we admire the author of such a work, we recognize with joy the hand of God Himself, and feel a certainty that we are dwelling in a house which defies all the storms of the future; the Son of God having said of it to the Prince of the Apostles: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

But all around this ark of safety which the waves bear up with reverence, what ruins, alas! what shattered fragments, what an immense, what a universal wreck! What a fearful spectacle of currents rushing in opposite directions, dragging into the abyss both the souls themselves and the frail shelters which they had built in the hope of finding safety in them!

There floats for an instant, soon to disappear in the gulf, all that men have essayed to substitute for apostolic and divine authority.

For a time they swore by the word of the new leaders whom they had chosen for themselves, and whom they called *Reformers*. Luther wished to bring the whole world into submission to his faith, although he did not always believe in what he himself had taught and no one has ever better refuted his own errors. And, now, at this day we see his "Complete Works" prohibited among his own sect in Saxony as a bad book.

Zwingle separated himself from the party of Luther during his lifetime, and becoming the leader of the Sacramentarians, is the object of all his fury. Muncer and Storch engaged in deducing their ultimate consequences from the Lutheran doctrines, and rejecting the *honeyed* Christ of their master, declare all law abrogated, all princely authority abolished, all property common, and urge on the Anabaptists to the bloody war of which they perish the victims. Knox carries over to Scotland their fanaticism and their violence. Carlstadt passes from Luther to

Zwingle, from Zwingle returns to Luther, and goes to die at Basle, regarded as a troublesome fellow by all parties. Bucer makes still more rapid evolutions, and owing to the subtilty of his equivocations, his definitive belief still remains a problem for all. Melancthon, alienated from Catholic truth by his vanity and his connections with Luther, regrets it all his life, advises his mother never to abandon it, and does not attach himself fixedly to any form of error: a Lutheran on some points, a Zwinglian on others, an unbeliever on many. He changes his system fourteen times on the article of justification alone.

Calvin devotes himself to reducing to system the religious temerities of Luther and Zwingle, modified by his own. He makes, unmakes, remakes his "Christian Institutes," as Beza will make and remake his translation of the New Testament, as many as seven times, and always in a different way. The Institutes, written in a carefully studied style, are for some time in fashion. At the present day, even in Calvin's own city, his authority is completely annihilated, and the prevailing theology is thoroughly anti-Calvinistic. As a man, Calvin has been exposed to public contempt by Galliffe; as a politician, he has seen his work utterly destroyed by Fazy; as a theologian, he has been convicted of absurdity and immorality by Cheneviere; but lately the pastor Martin preached a theory on justification diametrically opposed to Calvin's, which was favorably received.

The authority of the symbols of faith, drawn up by the reformers or their first disciples, has been no less ephemeral. At this day who believes in the articles of Smalcald or the Zetrapolitan Confession? in the Confession of faith sent by Melancthon to Francis I., and in the five or six different editions of the Confession of Augsburg? Who would sign the acts of the Synod of Dort? or regulate his belief according to the Lutheran or the Calvinist *consensus?* Who remembers the first and

second Helvetic confession of faith? What Protestant, supposing him an Anglican, would subscribe without (at least mental) restriction the thirty-nine articles of Elizabeth? If some synods still continue to assemble in our days, they begin by setting carefully aside from their debates all dogmatic questions. "There will no longer be any question of faith," said one minister, "either in black or in white." And if they preserve a confession of faith, it is on condition that it is decreed to be essentially variable, and that it shall not be a rule of faith for any one . . . . that at most it shall be a rule of teaching for the pastors.[1]

With their confessions of faith the religious truths most necessary to salvation, which were preserved for a time, but soon disfigured and distorted, have at last almost entirely disappeared. There remain but a few floating relics of them, always tossed about by the tempest of doubt.

The Trinity, of which Melancthon had wished to avoid the mention, and which Servetus had not denied with impunity, is soon attacked by the Socinians. At a later period the Armenians, who ultimately prevail over the rigid Calvinists, misrepresent it by subordinating the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father. At last rationalism rejects it with disdain. Chenevière declares it absurd. They go further still. Boëhm had taught Pantheism, Feuerbach does not shrink from atheism pure and simple; for him the being of God is nothing, but the being of man emancipated, purified, rendered objective.

Luther had greatly altered the doctrine of the Incarnation by his absurd system as to the *ubiquity* of the body of Jesus Christ. Socinus rejects the doctrine itself as impossible. At length, Socinian notions invade the German Lutheran Church, and Arianism insinuates itself into the Reformed Churches. It is the Protestant historian of the Reformation, Merle d'Aubigne, who states this. "Jesus," he goes on to say, "was considered

[1] See the debates of the Synod held at Lausanne in 1838.

in Germany first as a prophet, then as a sage, then as an enthusiast, and at last as an imposter." In Kant's view, the Son of Mary is the ideal of humanity. In Fichte's, the word is made flesh in every man who realizes the conceptions of his unity with God. In Strangs', there is no Christ but humanity. Soon for these extraordinary Christians, all will be God, except Christ Himself.

Original sin, of which the Reformers so greatly exaggerated the ravaging effects; which, according to them produced absolute corruption in man, and identified the infant just conceived with the very substance of sin, soon loses much of its gravity. It is not a personal fault, says George Calixtus, therefore there does not result from it any culpability for the children of Adam. Joseph de la Place, who looks on it as a disease, is condemned by the Synod of Charenton. But, owing to the progress of Rationalism, the Synod of Charenton is in its turn condemned; and by Eberhard, Töllner, and the greater part of our naturalizers, the fall of our first parents is relegated to the region of fables.

According to Luther and Melancthon, justification by faith alone was the sum and substance of the Gospel, *Summa Evangelii*. But this bulwark of the Reformation, defended with implacable vigor by the Synod of Dort, is soon attacked by the Synergists, the Arminians, the Socinians, the Wesleyan Methodists, and the rationalists. At this day it is like a fortress almost abandoned. Malan has undertaken to defend it. At Geneva they preach that it is impossible to continue faithful to the rigid system of Calvin without putting one's self in opposition not only with the primitive church, but with the whole of Christendom.[1]

They have come to this point in Germany. In the historical and political papers of Munich we read:[2] "The doctrine that man is justified by faith only, is now no

[1] *Conferences sur la Redemption*, vol. 2, p. 277.

[2] Vol., xxviii., p. 786. Letter from Wilh. Meinhold.

where heard in our pulpits." But it was this doctrine which gave birth to Protestanism, and hence it is called the fundamental principle of the Reformation. Luther knew well what he was saying, when he addressed this exhortation to his disciples: "Hold fast to this doctrine of justification by faith alone. If we lose it we shall no longer be in a condition to resist the devil and the Pope; much less to vanquish them." Nevertheless, in our days this article has been given up, and almost all the ministers have returned to the Catholic belief on this point. They teach that faith must act by love, and thus they bring down on their heads the curses of Luther and his brother reformers.

The church, to which at its first rise the Reformation had attributed the right of judging the Pope, Bishops, and Councils, soon finds itself deprived of its priesthood, which is declared to be common to all Christians; deprived of its power, which it abdicates into the hands of the State; deprived of its sacraments, which the rationalists take from it one after another, to such a point that at the present day, according to Newman, one half the people of England are not baptized; deprived of its worship, which being at first reduced to an optional attendance at a preaching, is now almost entirely done away with by the progress of individualism; in fine, it becomes in its own eyes something so uncertain and so vague, that Protestantism has never hitherto been able to find a definition of the Church on which it could rest. It must now despair of ever finding one.

The grand palladium of the Reformers, the Scripture itself, that Scripture so ill treated in the translations of Luther and Beza, is from the very first an object of contempt to the Anabaptist enthusiasts and the mystics. Théobold Thamer prefers to it conscience, *which is God Himself.* In Hobarg's eyes, it is *an old, dead, and chilly thing* which can only make Pharisees. At a later period the Arminians deny the inspiration of the historical

books. Then comes the rationalistic exegesis, which leaves nothing in the Bible untouched. Authenticity, integrity, truth, inspiration, all is made matter of question, all is denied. Semler believes that Christ, in sending the Holy Spirit to His Apostles, gave them entire liberty to teach whatever they believed true and good. Christ and His Apostles might be deceived, says Rohr. The Scripture speaks according to the religious opinions of the world at that time, says Henke. The sacred writers were not inspired in any other way than each one of us may be, says Schérer. The *Theopneustic* theologians, or defenders of inspiration become every day fewer and fewer.

Finally, we are told by the historian of the Reformation quoted above, that "while in Germany Bengel and Stillung discover in the Apocalypse that the end of the world is to come in 1836, rationalism no longer sees in the teaching of the Sacred Books, respecting things to come, or even the last judgment, anything but images and figures. In Hencke, and Wegscheider especially, it attacks everlasting punishment. . . . .Fichte and Schleiermacher hold that life eternal begins here below. . . . .a tendency which leads some doctors, among whom are Richtér, Strauss, etc., to entire unbelief respecting the future, and to a divinizing of the present, which is engendering *communism.*"

And here we have the fatal term which the Reformation is about to reach: the systematic disorganization of society, as it was constituted by Christianity. At its commencement, divorce came to dissolve marriage, the right of ecclesiastical property was denied, the notion of authority was impaired, the secret spring which raised souls to God was slackened, the bridle which restrained the passions gradually lost its power. After three centuries nothing remains but the place where a religious society once existed, and even there the ground is trembling. Yes, when all the embankments which the authority of the Reformers opposed to the torrent, confessions

of faith, fundamental truths, the Scriptures themselves have been broken down, it cannot but be that in their turn the social institutions established and sustained by the Christian faith should be carried away with all the rest. And when a man sees the flood carrying away not only his house but the very sand on which he had tried to build it, must he not at last acknowledge that that house is a ruin?

Now, Jesus Christ has just told us that they who choose such dwellings are not His. This good father of the family makes a point of giving his children a better lodging.

Such is the argument to which a new force is given by every twenty years of the history of Protestantism: for every twenty years sees new ruins accumulated. The Protestant *doctrines*, says Schleiermacher, last, on an average, fifteen years. If this calculation is correct, it would be easier to write a history of the waves of the ocean as they rise and break successively, than of each one of the *sects* which the Reformation has generated during the last three centuries.

I have stated the object of this treatise, the different materials of which it is composed, and the important lesson which ought to result from it in favor of the divine character of the Catholic Church. I shall add a few words more on the events in the midst of which it has been produced.

The latest historian of the Reformation uttered but lately a word which still is the alarm of Europe: *communism!* It is not I, it is he who attributes to Protestantism the parentage of this precursor of barbarism. For my own part, I am glad to acknowledge that a large number of Protestants believe in the future, disregard the present, practise the social virtues, and, both in their private and public conduct, show themselves opposed to communist tendencies: but, after all, history shows us that heretical sects have always been favorable to com-

munism. "The sects of the middle ages," says Mosheim, "believed that all ought to be common, and that thus robbery was allowable." "The Waldenses," says Reynier, "condemn all division of the earth into properties and of mankind into nations." From the time the war against the Papacy broke out, we have seen hostilities commenced against the property of the Church and of those who support it. The same text which according to the Reformers, proved that all Christians are priests, proves that by the same title they are all kings. Nothing would be more easy than to find in Luther and Calvin the principles of which such tragical applications were made by Muncer in Germany, Knox in Scotland, and the conspirators of Amboise in France.[1]

To deny the close relationship which exists between protesting against the authority of the Church and insurrection against secular authority, it would be necessary to deny the influence of religious doctrines on men's convictions, and of their convictions on their acts; it would be necessary to deny logic and history. Scarcely was the new Gospel preached when the war of thirty years in Germany, and the bloody struggles which ever since have so often been renewed in Flanders, Switzerland, France, etc., began to unfold themselves, as the bloody corollaries of these theological aberrations. These aberrations soon produce in London and Paris that unbelieving philosophy of which the initiations and mysteries are celebrated in the bosom of secret societies, and of which the reign was the Reign of Terror. They brought about that terrible crisis from which Europe is scarcely recovering, and which very nearly ruined it irrecoverably. Swiss Protestantism, excited by England, made wild by the phantom of Jesuitism which they exhibit at Lucerne, wished to avenge the check received by the freemasons, its advanced guard. It provoked there the armed struggle

[1] See "Le Protestantisme et les autres heresies dans leurs rapports avec le socialisme," by M. Nicolas.

against the purely defensive and especially religious alliance of the Swiss Catholics. Betrayed and abandoned by its natural defenders, the Sonderbund succumbed; and the easy victory of radicalism led to the sudden outbreak of the revolutions which overthrew established order in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Florence, Naples, Palermo, Turin, Rome. The first gun fired before Freiburg gave the signal; and owing to the concerted action of the secret societies, anarchy everywhere prevailed over authority; the French monarchy drifted away like a leaf before the wind, the Sovereign Pontiff was obliged to flee from Rome on the assassination of his minister and the siege of his palace, Europe had to fear that by the victory of the freemasons it would be carried back to barbarism.

And now they who have seen property, the family, public order no less seriously menaced in this tempest than Christian liberty, equality, and fraternity, are uniting their efforts to bring back society into its right course. They are eagerly desirous to recover peace, credit, the security of commerce, the stability of institutions. Accordingly, almost everywhere they are exalting authority, revising laws, organizing the defence of order, circulating books of a conservative tendency, sovereigns are forming alliances, political parties seeking to heal their differences. We see this need of mutual protection daily producing unlooked for results. Catholics owe to it the freedom restored to the Church of Austria, the concordat signed with Spain, the Pantheon restored to the worship of St. Genevieve, the first places in the French Senate assigned to cardinals, national education made more moral and more religious, and, above all, the restoration of the pontifical throne brought about by that crusade which went forth from Paris in the middle of the nineteenth century, a few months after the revolution of February. And yet, at this day, notwithstanding the imminent dangers to which the social fabric is exposed, what is the greatest obstacle to the concentration of all

the powers and strength which ought to secure and to save it? Is it not religious antagonism? Is it not this which impels the secret societies to attack Rome and the few conservative governments, who, in the holy authority of the Pontiff-King, can see and defend the principle of all authority?

The sole remedy for this religious anarchy in Europe, which sooner or later will bring on as its result, either the most complete political anarchy or heathen slavery under a yoke of iron, is the return to that unity of belief which at the origin of the Church made a multitude of men previously Jews or heathens, to be of "one heart and one soul," and which, during so many ages, has formed the greatness, the happiness, and the strength of Christendom; a return which does not presuppose the sacrifice of any conviction, of any certainty, but of all prejudice, all systematic opposition, all determination to adhere to the side we have taken up, all voluntary doubts which would soon be dissipated by study and reflection.

This reconciliation of all Christian communions is not impossible. For God desires it; Jesus Christ prayed for it on the eve of His death; the dangers to which society is exposed call for it; the experience of the past facilitates it; the widely diffused means of information are favorable to it. It will no longer be hindered by despotism, nor by that prestige of authority which surrounded the Apostles of Reform, nor by those pretexts which the vices or the ignorance of the clergy might have afforded to the Reformation, nor by that fanaticism which might have misled nations that were simple or credulous to an excess. Besides, it is not granted to error to prevail forever; and when, producing its ultimate results, it arms its most enthusiastic partisans against the dearest interests and the most sacred principles of humanity, we ought to see a movement in the opposite direction among minds of a higher order; and such never return alone to the camp of truth.

Now the most obvious and the surest means of bring ing about this reconciliation is, it seems to me, to put before Protestants our doctrine, such as the Church herself defined it at the Council of Trent.

In order that protests against her may be made with knowledge and intelligence, it is necessary to know her, and to know her not on the authority of lying rumors, but on that of authentic documents. Now the documents necessary for the revision of an unjust trial and sentence are all supplied in this work. Pass, if you will, over my introductions and preambles, I readily consent to that; but before protesting against the Council itself, at least hear what it says!

In the name then of the most pressing motives, under circumstances the most favorable, I call on all those who differ from us to hear in their own tongue the teaching of the Church respecting the truths which can alone save them in this present life, or in the everlasting future. I call on them from Geneva, which three centuries ago placed itself as the bulwark or rather as the vanguard of the Reformation, and which I see peacefully invaded by Catholicism; and I sum up my desires and my hopes in those words which, encircling the Holy name of Jesus, serve as the motto of that once Calvinistic city, *Post tenebras lux!*

That the end which I propose to myself and the means which I wish to employ may be better understood, I may be allowed to recall a fact narrated in the Bible, which is not without some analogy to the history of our own times.

After seventy years of a cruel captivity, the people of God, returning to Jerusalem, began among innumerable obstacles to rebuild their temple and their walls. This work lasted for many years. It had almost reached its termination when, on the first day of the seventh month, they were able to celebrate the feast of the tabernacles with a pomp long unknown, and amid an immense con-

course of people. On that day, by order of Nehemias, Esdras, a priest and doctor of the law, was appointed to read over to the people the ordinances of Moses. The crowd had come, as one man, to the street before the water gate. There Esdras, having thirteen of the chief men of the nation on his right and left, and having placed thirteen Levites among the immense multitude to preserve silence and order, began by pronouncing in a loud voice a form of blessing to the glory of the Most High; and all the people raising their hands to heaven, then prostrating themselves on the ground to adore the Lord, answered: *Amen!* Amen!

Then taking the book of the law in his hand, Esdras began to read it in a clear and intelligible voice; and his reading which was begun in the morning was continued till noon, and was resumed the next day and all those that followed until the octave. The fruits of conversion which it produced were marvellous. Many times were Nehemias, Esdras, and the Levites obliged to comfort the people, who were cast into deep sorrow and wept bitterly at the remembrance of their infractions of God's law. The feast of Tabernacles, and afterwards the other solemnities, were celebrated exactly according to the rites prescribed by Moses. The rest of the Sabbath day was religiously observed, the alliances contracted with women who were strangers to their religion, were broken off; morals underwent a thorough reformation; all imposed on themselves a solemn fast, during which they were clothed with sackcloth, and covered with ashes, and confessed their own sins and the iniquities of their fathers; lastly, the covenant of the people with the Lord was renewed in a solemn act proclaimed by eight Levites, and subscribed with an oath by the heads of all the families.

Thus, together with the material restoration of Sion and of the temple was the moral resurrection of the people of God effected; thus by a twofold miracle was lit again

both the sacred fire on the altar which ought never to have been extinguished, and that which ought at all time to burn in the hearts of the people.

Well, Christian Europe at the present day seems to be in travail with a similar restoration. She seeks to recover from a violent shock, and to find again her place in the world. Almost everywhere, as at Jerusalem on the return from captivity, they are raising up ruined edifices, here temples, there schools, fortresses, barracks, prisons, courts of law. But "unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." This is beginning to be understood, and the aid of religion is no longer disdained. Not only are Catholic nations returning to a more practical and more docile recognition of the authority of the Church, but Protestant nations are moving. The members of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have already returned to the bosom of our Mother Church by hundreds. Dr. Pusey, in his Eirenicon, does not refuse to accept the definitions of the Council of Trent as the common symbol of all Christian communions. He even admits, though not with sufficient definiteness, the supremacy of the successor of St. Peter. This movement towards return is communicating itself to Protestant Germany, listening in astonishment, with that interest which error never inspires, to the children of Ignatius and Liguori. Geneva has been filled with admiration in hearing the Catholic Doctrine of Justification, set forth almost completely by one of the pastors of the National Church. I myself, a religious of the Com pany of Jesus, have been able to preach the substance of this work there, to a mixed audience of Catholics and Protestants; not only without opposition, without murmurs, but with many consoling results both in actual conversions and still more in promises and hopes. The touching virtues of Pius IX., the kindness, indulgence, long suffering of this father, so patient and liberal in pardoning, ought to recall to the lips of his erring and

guilty children the words of the prodigal: "I will arise and go to my Father!" To aid them in this difficult path, the amnesty of the Jubilee has been repeatedly accorded them.

The moment is well chosen. Let our separated brethren then imitate the children of Israel interrupting the building of their temple and their walls to read again the divine law, forgotten by so many. Let them all gather as one man not around the chair of Moses and of Esdras, but around that of Simon Peter and Pius IX. Let them take into their hands that book so short, so solid, so winning by its truth, against which they have so long protested without knowing it. Let them read, with attention and with minds divested of prejudice, those definitions of the Council of Trent, of which the adoption makes the Catholic, and the rejection the Protestant.

I will undertake, if they wish it, the office of reader. To give more interest to the reading, to make it more easy to be understood, I will introduce it by preliminary considerations, which without pretending to serve as gloss, or scholium, or commentary, or any way as an interpretation of the text, will endeavor to justify the dogmatic definitions of the Council by Scripture, tradition and theological reasons, and will bear sometimes on the truth, more frequently on the good effects of our belief and occasionally on the beauty of our rites. In these introductions I have desired to combine clearness with brevity, and the interest of occasional narratives with the severity of a theological composition.

The Council of Trent had no need to define certain doctrines which the reformers of that age had respected, but which could not escape the attacks of their disciples: those, for instance, of the Trinity and the divinity of Jesus Christ. I have thought that I ought not to pass silently over these primary articles of every Christian creed.

I have wished to translate the whole dogmatic part of the Council of Trent, not out of disrespect for translations already existing, but with the wish to give one which would be more easy and more agreeable to the generality of readers. This is the reason why I have omitted all the Chapters which treat of Reform, why the doctrinal chapters relating to one and the same subject have often been separated from the canons, why some paragraphs have been divided, and finally why the text of the Council is not presented continuously from the first to the last session, but distributed according to the order of the subjects. It will however always be easy to distinguish the words of the Holy Church from all others. To that Church I submit with filial confidence all my judgments, all my assertions, all my thoughts.

Shall I have the satisfaction of gaining the attention, of touching the hearts, in a word, of being understood, as was Esdras? Et intellexerunt cum legeretur.[1] I hope so, not from the merit of my work, but from the mercy of Jesus Christ, solicited by the prayers and sufferings of the Church, drawn down especially by the intercession of her whom Jesus Christ calls His mother, and whom we venerate as the Virgin Immaculate in her Conception, as the Health of the sick, the Consoler of the afflicted, the Refuge of sinners, the aid of Christians, the deadly and victorious enemy of all heresies.

[1] II. Esdras, viii. 8

CHAPTER FIRST.

On the authority of the Church and its Head.

I.

Concerning Faith.

Man has within him the idea of God; it is impressed on his inmost soul.

The idea of God is the idea of the Infinite Being, essentially true and good, the sovereign author of our being: and therefore possessing at all times, and exercising when He thinks proper, in virtue of that goodness and truth, the most entire and absolute *authority* over us.

We conceive that this infallible authority, or *this right of an author over his own work*, may be exercised by the Author of all being, either directly by Himself or through the intervention of an angel, a prophet, or one or more of His creatures. And in fact, it is the divine authority which we love to recognize in the just commands of our superiors in the family or the state. Reason, as well as faith, tells us that *all authority is from God.*[1]

But can God, independently of this communication of power to His representatives in the family and in the political community, exercise His authority over us, mediately or immediately? Yes; undoubtedly. Can He command the understanding to admit certain truths, the will to perform certain duties, the senses to impose on themselves certain sacrifices? Unquestionably; these several rights cannot be separated from the very idea of an omnipotent authority, founded on infinite truth, justice and goodness.

If it happen then, that by means of a positive revelation, the Author of our understanding enjoins on us

[1] Non est potestas nisi a Deo. (*Rom.* xiii. 1.)

certain truths to be admitted, we must respond, by an act of faith, to the infinite Intelligence exercising His authority over us. Nor could anything be more conformable to right reason than this act of submission by a created mind to the Mind that created it.

Faith, therefore, which, as the apostle expresses it,[1] "bringeth into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ," implies the submission of the human to the Divine intelligence; a submission which becomes obligatory, and consequently eminently reasonable and secure, as soon as the obligation of believing is manifested to the conscience,—that is to say, *as soon as a man conceives the supreme authority of God to be actually exercised upon him*, and only then.

Thus to the voice of its Maker, a voice clearly evidenced and distinctly heard, all room for fear, either from the illusions of fanaticism or the exaggerations of enthusiasm being excluded, the mind at once says, *Amen*—It is so! It subdues its curiosity, it brings into subjection the natural impulse which urges it to independence; it stops further investigations; it repudiates doubt; it admits, as an act of adhesion to a supreme intelligence, the truth of the mysterious propositions enunciated by the Word of God. This truth may, like the doctrine of the Trinity, be impenetrable to human sagacity; it may, as in the case of the mystery of the Cross, disconcert our prejudices or run counter to our passions; it matters not: if God has spoken I must obey, I obey therefore,—I believe. Such was the perfect obedience of those holy souls whose faith has been lauded by St. Paul,—of Noah, of Abraham, of Moses, of the Hebrew people, when they advanced boldly through the waves of the Red Sea. This faith, as the Apostle says,[2] *gives* a kind of *substance to things hoped for*, and shows as present *things that appear not. Without*

[1] In captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi. (*II Cor.* x. 5.)

[2] Sperandarum substantia rerum et argumentum non apparentium. (*Heb.* xi. 1.)

such *faith*, he says again,[1] *it is impossible to please God;* because without it we cannot conceive such a subordination of the human intelligence to the divine, as would lead to the submission of our will to the will of God, and of the very senses and the entire creature to Him who is the Creator of our whole being.

II.

On the relation between private judgment and faith.

Private judgment applied to a divine revelation, may either ascertain its reality or investigate its subject.

When one who does not believe considers seriously the preliminary question: *Is it God that speaks?*—he fulfils a duty, he acts in obedience to his reason. Far from offending the divine Majesty, he does homage to it; for that supreme authority is interested in its presence and its language being distinguished from all others—in our never confounding the voice of the creature with the voice of the Creator. Besides, the Author of Revelation is no other than the Author of reason. He intends reason to serve as our guide till she herself hands us over to the guidance of faith: and to obey faith is still to obey reason, which by implication has already established the duty and the obligation of believing.

But after this obligation has once been proved, should *private judgment* presume to approach with the hesitation of doubt this utterance of infinite authority, and consequently of incontestable truth; to scrutinize its depths with irreverent gaze, and with a settled determination to reject all that does not with clearest evidence shine forth before its eyes? Should it claim to constitute itself the supreme judge of the intrinsic consistency and mysterious harmony of propositions such as these: "*The divine Nature subsists indivisible in Three Persons.*"—"*The one Person of the Word unites in Christ two distinct natures,*" etc., etc.?

[1] *Heb.* xi. 6.

No, for in that case man would be citing God Himself before His tribunal: he would be claiming to subject the judgment of God to his own judgment: to correct His statements, to amend His propositions, to reform His works. Faith would no longer be obedience but tyranny; it would not be submission to God, but an exercise of authority over God; it would not be an assent of the understanding to the divine word, but a search in the spirit of distrust and curiosity for evidence which is reserved as a recompense for faith in another life. It would even be like the profane gaze of the people of Bethsames on the Holy Ark, which cost the lives of so many of those sacrilegious men.

In the case then of a person who does not believe, there is a prudent and pious examination which precedes faith, which predisposes his understanding to receive this gift of grace, and convinces it of the duty of accepting it in a teachable spirit: there is also a presumptuous, irreligious examination, which destroys faith by making the truth of God's words subordinate to the judgment of men.

It is easy to illustrate this distinction by an example. Suppose a magistrate informs us of an order which he says has emanated from the supreme power; two questions may at once be made the subject of examination: Does this order really emanate from the supreme authority? Supposing it authentic, just and valid, shall we obey it? To submit the first proposition to an attentive examination is the duty of every good citizen, and implies nothing offensive to the authorities:—as to the second question it is seditious, nor to be tolerated, tending to elude the law and to overthrow society.

The difference between the power of a temporal sovereign and the supreme power of God is, that when the mandate of an earthly sovereign has been promulgated we still may, and in case of doubt, we should, examine whether it is consistent with justice; whereas when the mandate of God is known, when the fact of the Revela-

tion has been proved, it is absurd, it is impious to examine whether this Divine declaration be true and just.

When, however, the divine matter of the Revelation has once been admitted with humble and submissive faith, there is nothing to prevent the Christian from attentively studying its mysteries, both as a whole and in detail: its dogmatic and its moral teaching; the lessons of Holy Scripture, the definitions of Councils, and the harmony between revealed religion and science or philosophy. This kind of study, which has been the delight of men of the greatest genius, will always be recommended by the Church; it will always be pleasing to God, and profitable to him who engages therein, provided it be always carried on in a reverential and tractable spirit, which seeks a better acquaintance with the terms of the divine revelation only that it may adhere to it with greater intelligence and love. But this docility of an attentive disciple is as far removed as heaven from hell, from the fault-finding examination of a sceptic; or of a judge who wishes to discover that his Divine Master is wrong—who would revise His acts and appeal from God Himself to God better informed. This blind presumption brings dogma down to the level of a philosophical opinion; it treats faith as if it were one of the discoveries of human thought, and destroys entirely that free, meritorius, supernatural character which, by consent of all theologians, is the property of this virtue. It is accompanied by hesitation and doubt; and unbelief and scepticism follow in its train; it is opposed not merely to religion, but also to reason which prescribes entire submission to the authority of God.

We shall soon see that *private judgment*, in the only sense in which it can be exercised legitimately and consistently with faith, is wanting, not among the faithful children of the Catholic Church, but among those very sects that raised the standard of revolt against her, and inscribed upon their banners, "*The right of private judgment!*"

III.

To refuse to believe in any Church, whatsoever be the characters and proofs of its divine mission, would be culpable unbelief.

The authority of God may be exercised upon us immediately or through some medium. This medium may be one individual or several.

For example: the Lord appears to Moses; He commands him to set His people free. The fact of the divine presence is verified by the five consecutive miracles which are recorded in the third and fourth chapters of Exodus. *The idea of the divine authority exercising itself upon him is complete*, and forces itself on his understanding; his conscience feels that it is under an obligation to believe; individual examination has deliberately verified it; he believes, and by his faith the Israelites will be saved.

Again: Jesus Christ presents Himself to the Jews and says: I am the Messiah announced by the Prophets and expected by all nations; and in proof that what I assert is true, Nature obeys me,—the blind receive their sight, the deaf hear, the lame walk, paralytics are cured, the dead are restored to life, the poor have the gospel preached to them. At the sight of these miracles, those Jews who give heed to them feel that the obligation of believing in this word of power is imposed upon their consciences. *The idea of divine authority exercised on them by means of a person sent from God, a Messiah, is presented, forces itself on their minds, and demands their submission:* some obey this obligation and become *disciples* or *Apostles:* the majority refuse to be converted, are rejected from the covenant, and soon afterward are driven out by the Romans, and trodden under foot by all nations.

But there is yet a third mode in which the Divine authority may be supernaturally made known. Suppose that this same Messiah, wishing His doctrine, His laws, His sacrifice, His sacraments, to be perpetuated on earth,

had formed a certain number of His followers, called *Apostles* and *disciples*, into a teaching Society which He had invested with His own authority, and to which He had promised His presence and assistance till the end of the world; that He had given it certain characteristics by which it could be recognized and which no merely human society could possibly reproduce: for instance—a mission supernaturally received from Himself by the Apostles in person, and transmitted uninterruptedly from hand to hand; perfect unity which cannot be impaired; sanctity attested by miracles; universal diffusion and perpetual duration, notwithstanding the unceasing opposition of demons and evil men, &c., &c. In this hypothesis, which, as we shall presently see is a reality, *the idea of a religious society established by our Lord as the depository and interpreter of His words will be found realized*, and the obligation of believing its teachings will force itself upon the conscience. It will be a duty to respond to this Church by an act of faith, and to say in the words of her creed, *Credo sanctam Ecclesiam*—I believe in the Holy Church.

To resist would be culpable unbelief.

And on what reasonable grounds could such resistance be justified?

Would you impose on God the obligation of revealing His thoughts and His will to each of us, without any intervening medium? But what right has a creature to lay down a law for the Creator, and that law in itself the most absurd? Is it not most worthy of infinite wisdom to obtain its ends by means, at once the most simple and most fruitful of results? In order to give us light does God create a distinct sun for each separate man? To assist our understandings does He make a revelation of language and of written characters to each? Is it not by means of a single pair that He has peopled the earth, and conferred on all the children of men the power of speech together with life? In domestic and political society,

He establishes and maintains order by communicating His authority to parents and chiefs. If then in the physical, as well as in the domestic and political order, God is pleased to exercise His preserving power over us by means of other created beings, and that according to the simplest laws, shall we refuse Him the power of transmitting in the same manner the divine teaching of Him who long ago appeared among men as the Way, the Truth and the Life, and of thus conveying His word even to our own times pure and preserved from all error? Must our Lord, in order to avoid wounding our pride, draw up as many Creeds, write as many Bibles, organize as many Churches, as there are men? In such a useless multiplication of means which are calculated only to isolate men from one another, where would be that simplicity, so fruitful of results, which marks the ways of God and which is the seal of His infinite wisdom?

Do not allege in reply that men are all fallible, all sinners, all equal. The conclusion to be drawn from that truth is, that *of themselves* they are not possessed of any superior authority relatively to each other; not, that God, if it seem good to Him, supplying their insufficiency, is unable to invest them with a certain portion of His authority. In the natural order of things He governs children through their parents, citizens by means of their magistrates; so, in a superior order, He can make use of Moses to give laws to the Hebrews, of the Archangel Gabriel to carry to Mary the announcement of our salvation, of Peter to confirm the Apostles in the faith, of the Church to make it "the pillar and ground (or firm support) of the truth," and to protect us from the fluctuations of error.[1]

Undoubtedly—we may say to those who reject the authority of any Church whatsoever—undoubtedly you are right in not yielding submission to the words of any man without examination; in not lightly attributing to

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 15.

this or that created being anything that your eyes and ears do not at first discern in him. But, nevertheless, be on your guard: it is as necessary to adore God as it is important not to adore man; you are just as dependent on the Creator as you are independent of any creature. God may exercise His authority over you by means of other men who are naturally on a level with yourselves, reason teaches you this, and it is upon this principle alone you obey your superiors, in the family or in the State. Consider, then, whether God does not act in the same way in what concerns your salvation. Without this precaution you may run a risk of rebelling against God, when you suppose you are only resisting man; and may be openly contravening the dictates of reason, while you glory in being guided by reason alone.

IV.

To believe in any church whatsoever at random, would be unreasonable credulity.

From the principles we have laid down it follows, in the first place, that a determination not to put faith in any Church, even though there should be one that appeared to us possessed of characteristics indicating it to have been instituted and to be guided by God Himself, is an unbelieving frame of mind, not only supremely unreasonable but also insulting to the authority of God.

On the other hand it would be a credulity, not less unreasonable, to put faith in a sect destitute of the marks of the true Church.

A person presents himself to you, bearing a mere human name, speaking a language which is not that of one having authority, making you the judge and ultimate arbiter of the truth of what he teaches. In his teaching unity is wanting as well as authority. He changes, he retracts, he corrects, and contradicts himself continually. His doctrine, instead of leading to a refor-

mation of life, rather allows free scope to the human passions. He preaches to a small number of followers who affix his name or that of their country to their creed. Do not demand of him, who sends him; he has separated himself from the Church, the bearer of the Apostolic commission; his whole mission he has received from a temporal sovereign, the community, or his own private inspiration. Neither ask him to prove his mission by miracles; he has separated himself, or rather has been cut off from that Church to which, by the testimony of history, belong the workers of miracles, prophets and martyrs. Assuredly such a man even though talented, learned, and eloquent, even though he offered you every worldly advantage, though he tried by every means to mislead you, yet would he never be able to persuade you to accept his books which he calls *inspired*, his confession of faith which he entitles *evangelical*, or his doctrine which he styles *reformed*. You see in him merely a man, without any sacred character, without a mission, without a divine confirmation; you could not, except by insulting God, Himself, accept such a man as His minister and organ. Such conduct would be an illusion in you; it would be good faith unworthily tampered with; it would be unpardonable credulity.

What has been said of a single preacher, is equally applicable to many, whether they form a *consistory*, a *synod*, a *venerable congregation*, or any other union; the name matters little. A certain number of men, called *ministers* or *pastors*, forming a religious association, distinguished from others by the name of a man,—of Nestorius, for example, or Donatus, or Eutyches—or by that of the country they inhabit, as Greece, England, &c.,—present themselves before you and wish to inscribe your name among their members. Besides this name of a man, whose merit may be called into question, or of a country which is but a small portion of the universe, what strikes your attention in this pretended church is, the complete

absence of all authority in its teaching. They do not speak at all the language of authority "as having power"—*tanquam potestatem habens;* but they hesitate, they submit their claims to discussion: nay, they even lay it down as a fundamental maxim, that every believer, by the inspiration of his own private judgment and the reading of a certain book, is qualified to draw up a creed for himself. They decide that they have nothing to decide, they define that there is nothing to be defined.

You next observe the absence of unity in this doctrine, which changes every few years, in every degree of latitude, and after a brief fifteen years, would not be able to recognize itself. What a long history is that of the variations of even the least numerous and the most recent sect! What afflicting uncertainty must result from this perpetual fluctuation! And how can we place any firm faith in a creed to-day, when to-morrow perhaps it will be replaced by another? I admit, on the other hand, that its moral teaching is not exacting in its demands. Divorce allowed very easily—religious observances not too frequent—scarcely any external worship; in a word whatever places a restraint on natural inclinations is set aside; the evangelical counsels are removed out of sight; fasting, abstinence, confession of sins, declared to be abuses and superstitious. Sanctity and heroic devotedness no longer spring up on that soil which was once so fertile in them, although moral virtues such as truth, probity and benevolence are found in many. Miracles have disappeared in company with the saints, and supernatural operations are so entirely unknown as to be regarded as impossible. This church, which should be spread over the whole earth—if its mission were the salvation of the world,—is wholly confined, with all its different subdivisions, within the limits of a province, a town, a particular section. It is a notorious fact that in such a year, and on such a day, by the act of such an apostate priest, or dogmatizing king, this little society was detached from the existing

Church which called itself then and which still calls itself, *Catholic and Apostolic*—that is to say, universal and perpetual. At that time, then, there was a separation, a voluntary or involuntary breaking off from the Church then in possession of the right to teach the faith. It is not history alone which attests this fact, but the very name of the man or country which this separated sect bears, is at it were, branded on its forehead. Add to this that most of its ministers receive their mission not from Jesus Christ and his Apostles, but from the State, the king, nay in even the queen: that among them, for want of a head universally recognized as the Vicar of Jesus Christ, there is neither actual nor possible unity.

Add moreover, that within the bosom of this society which is thus destitute of all the outward characters of truth, symptoms of error abound. It answers fully to the idea reason and history give us of provinces in revolt against legitimate authority. In a sect cut off from the true Church it is natural to expect this hatred towards the Mother Church, this absence of unity and of any bond of union, this dependence on the State—a dependence which proves that the State is far too clearsighted to put any faith in such a church, or to submit itself to its principles of morality or of belief which are essentially variable. There must needs be an absence of *sanctity*; for, it is only to follow their passions that men forsake the truth which puts a restraint on them. There must needs be an absence of *Catholicity* or universality; for truth alone can rule and enforce obedience everywhere throughout the world; error has not sufficient strength to exercise an authority so extensive. Lastly, there must of necessity be an absence of *Apostolicity*, for, on the one hand, it is with the Apostles and their legitimate succes sors, the Incarnate Truth promised to abide until the end of the world, and on the other He enjoined on these same Apostles to regard as *heathens* and *publicans* those who should reject their teaching. It follows therefore that

the Apostolic Church can never cease to be the true Church, and that a false church can never with any shadow of truth call itself the Apostolic Church.

"It must needs be that scandals come," our Saviour has said;[1] "there must be also heresies," are the words of the Apostle.[2] These must be, because the truth is too severe for the passions; hence its fate is to be always combated by them. But what is the character of that passion and of the attacks which heresy transforms into articles of faith? Passion is variable, indulgent, local, short-lived; it hesitates, because it distrusts its own strength; it provokes by its outbursts the arm even of arbitrary authority, which supports it: but above all things it detests that legitimate authority which can never give it quarter. Such is passion, and such also is heresy, in all places and at all times.

I restrict myself purposely to general statements. As to the special form under which this or that sect presents itself, it is useless to trace it out; such details would be too tedious. I will content myself, as I am writing especially for France, with showing our reformed churches the sketch which has been drawn of them by one of their own children, since become the head master of a school.[3] The portrait is not flattering. "The ruin of all truth, the weakness of infinite division, the scattering of flocks, ecclesiastical anarchy .... socinianism ashamed of itself, rationalism coated like a pill, without doctrine, without consistency," this is what M. Schérer beholds, with bitter sorrow, in his reformed church .... or rather, he says: "This church, deprived alike of its corporate and its dogmatic character, of its form and of its doctrine, deprived of all that constituted it a christian church, and distinguished it as a particular church, has in truth ceased to exist in the ranks of religious communities. Its name continues, but it represents only a corpse, a phantom, or

[1] Matth. XVIII. 7. [2] 1 Cor. XI. 19.

[3] De l'état actuel de l'Eglise réformée en France (1844.)

if you will, a memory or a hope .... Our Faculties of Theology," he proceeds, "teach orthodoxy and rationalism without distinction. A given professor can without control and without being unfaithful to his engagements, overthrow revealed religion by criticism, and natural religion by speculation. Pastors enjoy the same latitude. They are opposed one to another, and so likewise are the churches, and even consistories. We have no longer any ecclesiastical institutions properly so called, nor unity, nor religious government .... Pastors vigorously anathematize each other .... and, for want of a dogmatic authority, UNBELIEF HAS MADE ITS WAY INTO THREE-FOURTHS OF OUR PULPITS."

A writer who has studied most profoundly, and has the most intimate personal experience of the Anglican Church, Dr. Newman, has drawn the following picture of it:[1]

"We see in the English Church, I will not merely say, no descent from the first ages, and no relationship to the Church in other lands, but we see no body politic of any kind; we see nothing more or less than an establishment, or department of government, or a function or operation of the State,—without a substance—a mere collection of officials, depending on and living in the supreme civil power. Its unity and personality are gone, and with them its power of exciting feelings of any kind..... It is responible for nothing; it can appropriate neither praise nor blame; but whatever feeling it raises, is, by the nature of the case, to be referred to the Supreme Power whom it represents, and whose will is its breath..... As a thing without a soul, it does not contemplate itself, define its intrinsic constitution, or ascertain its position. It has no traditions; it cannot be said to think; it does not know what it holds, and what it does not; it is not even conscious of its own existence. It has no love for its members, or what are sometimes called its children; nor any instinct whatever, unless attachment to its master, or

[1] Newman's Lectures on Anglican Difficulties. pp. 7—9.

love of its peace, may be so called. Its fruits, as far as they are good, are to be made much of while they are present, for they are transient, and without succession; its former champions of orthodoxy are no earnest of orthodoxy now; they died, and there is no reason why they should be reproduced. Bishop is not like Bishop, more than king is like king, or ministry like ministry; its Prayer Book is an act of Parliament of two centuries ago, and its cathedrals and its chapter houses are the spoils of Catholicism. . . It is as little bound by what it said or did formerly as this morning's newspaper by its former numbers. . . . . Its life is an act of Parliament. . . It will be able to resist heresies, while the State gives the word; it would be unable, when the State forbids it. Elizabeth boasted that she 'tuned its pulpits;' Charles forbade discussions on predestination; George on the Holy Trinity; Victoria allows differences on holy Baptism. While the nation wishes an Establishment it will remain . . . and that which determines its existence will determine its voice. . . . . As the nation changes its political, so may it change its religious views; the causes which carried the Reform Bill and Free Trade may make short work with orthodoxy."

Once more I repeat, if, on the authority of such a society as this, though it were composed of learned, virtuous, able and eloquent men, you received books as divine, a creed as evangelical, a doctrinal or moral precept as obligatory, you must admit that you would deserve the reproach of being careless, inconsiderate and credulous; you would say "I believe in the Holy Church," without attaching any distinct idea to your words; you would strangely give up your right of private judgment, and you could not with a good grace tax any one with idolatry or superstition; you would not deserve the name of a man who thought for himself, and your faith would scarcely be that *reasonable*, that rational submission of which the Apostle speaks: *Rationabile obsequium vestrum.*[1]

[1] Rom. xii. 1.

V.

To believe in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which, by these supernatural characteristics justifies the obligation it imposes on us of recognizing its authority, is the only true, the only reasonable faith in the Church.

To refuse to believe in any church whatever, though it appear to us to be possessed of all the distinguishing characteristics of a divine institution, is unreasonable incredulity.

To give adhesion to a sect, destitute of these characteristics is culpable credulity.

Faith, therefore, real faith, at once docile and prudent, humble and reflecting, as far removed from proud unbelief as from superstitious credulity, faith, the homage of an honest understanding and a pure heart, must be the assent given to the only Church which, by its titles and its superhuman character, justifies the obligation it imposes on us, of believing in it as the organ which preserves and interprets the revelation of Christ.

We have now to ascertain what these characteristics are, and whether there exists a society invested with them.

Was it the will of our Lord that His teaching, His institutions, and the laws of His religion, should come down unimpaired even to our own times? In that case He must have instituted a Church, which should be the depository of His doctrine, the guardian of His laws, the dispenser of His graces. Now, the following are the marks which according to the presumption and requirements of reason herself, ought to characterize such a society.

It ought to be ALONE of its KIND and ONE. ALONE of its KIND; for one divinely instituted Church being sufficient for its object, why institute two or more? ONE; for our Saviour not having to unsay His words, to reform his laws, or to revise and correct His plans, His Church ought to maintain all its members invariably in the belief of the

same doctrine, in obedience to the same laws, in participation in the same sacraments, in submission to the same pastors, and that, by acknowledging the same visible Head, established and assisted by its Divine Head.

It ought to be HOLY, not only in its Founder, its doctrine, its laws, its sacraments, its institutions, its worship —but also in a certain number of its members, in whom the means of sanctification with which it abounds, produce their full fruits.

It ought to be CATHOLIC, that is to say, UNIVERSAL, both in its *duration* which is to embrace all times, and in its *empire* which it should unceasingly labor to make co-extensive with the whole world, since without doubt, God desires the salvation of all men as His creatures.

It ought to be APOSTOLIC, that is to say, put in possession by the Saviour Himself, in the persons of His first ministers, called Apostles, of the right of teaching and governing men, and maintained in this possession by the legitimate successors of these same Apostles, or envoys of God.

And at the same time that examination verifies the existence of these characteristics in her, *this Church ought to teach with sovereign authority* that these supernatural signs belong to her; because, being charged with the duty of requiring from us faith in her Creed and her Scriptures, and obedience to her commands, it is necessary that she should begin by making it our duty to believe in her institutions, her mission, in a word, her divine authority.

Is it not plain that this religious society, which, diffused through the five portions of the world, has lived through so many centuries, preserving in spite of this universal diffusion, in spite of this perpetual duration, in spite of the opposition of all the passions of mankind, an unvarying unity in her teaching of dogmas which are above the grasp of reason, and of a morality which crucifies nature, has a right to our confidence and our faith! Unity of belief in a great number of persons, says Tertul-

lian, is the result and the proof not of error, but of tradition.[1]

This society, consisting of men like ourselves, has nevertheless been able to exalt humanity above itself, even to a sanctity attested by miracles, and proclaimed not only by earth, but by heaven; "men," says our saviour, "do not gather grapes from brambles."[2]

This society is strong enough to subdue, by the ever-subsisting miracle of her Catholicity, a bitter and obstinate opposition which has been renewed in all times and in all places.

This society, in fine, received originally as a notorious fact, the Apostolic or divine commission; is still in the knowledge and sight of the whole universe the sole depositary of it: and, while ready to exhibit to every gainsayer her title-deeds and letters of credit, nevertheless teaches all men, in the name of the Lord, that it is their duty to believe in her divine institution and authority, and consequently to submit to her teaching and laws.

Would not the refusal of faith to a society clothed with these characteristics, be *to deny to God the right which He undoubtedly has, of making a human society the depositary, the guardian and the interpreter of His revelation?* Would it not be to resist *the duty of believing in the Infinite authority exercising itself by means of the Church, a duty intimated to us by our conscience?* Would it not be culpable unbelief? Did they who believed in Jesus Christ see Him perform acts more manifestly miraculous than the altogether supernatural existence of this religious society? Would not all the laws which have governed human nature ever since the fall be supplanted by laws wholly contrary to them. In humanity, such as sin has made it, reason feels a repugnance to mystery; holiness is repulsive to flesh and blood; diffusion over time and space introduces variation and decay; authority, if usurped,

[1] Quod unum apud multos invenitur non est erratum, sed traditum.
[2] Luc. VI. 44.

has no faith in itself; if it will not bend, it ultimately succumbs under the efforts of a struggle for victory; in no case does it possess the heavenly sanction of miracles. A religious society then, such as we have described, would be a living contradiction to all these laws.

And yet this Church exists.

Yes; the picture we have drawn, far from being ideal, is copied from life. We have only to open our eyes.[1] Two hundred millions of Christians, not counting the thirty millions of baptized infants, vivified by the life of Christ, amongst heretics and schismatics, bear the name of the Church of Jesus Christ—the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church. The object of this great society is to lead men to the ultimate end of their creation, that is, to the blessedness of heaven by the profession of the true religion. It is outward, visible, complete in itself, distinct and independent of any other society, and provided with all the means of self-preservation, propagation and purification, which can aid it in the attainment of its end.

This Church is ONE, that is to say, held together by submission to the same head, in the unvarying confession of one and the same faith, in obedience to the same code of morals, participation in the same sacraments, celebration of the same worship. She is therefore, one in fact as well as in theory, nor has difference of time nor separation of places ever been able to produce the variation of a single iota or a single point in the revealed dogma or law. Unceasingly assailed by new errors, this Church, always and everywhere consistent with herself, explains and developes her earlier definitions, without even the shadow of a change appearing. She has declared a hundred times that she can introduce no innovations; and that, deprived of the power to originate anything in matters of reve-

[1] See this argument more fully developed in that excellent work, Milner's End of Religious Controversy; and in the dissertation on Catholic and Protestant Churches, by Card. De la Luzerne.

lation, she has only the right of verifying the divine doctrine in Scripture and tradition.

She is HOLY in her Founder; she recognizes no other founder than the Holy of Holies: she is holy in her doctrine, her precepts, and in the means of sanctification with which she supplies her children. The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ is celebrated and His sacraments dispensed; the ministry of public prayer and preaching is exercised; the evangelical counsels and the most sublime self-devotion are practised in their fullest extent. The clergy are kept in the observance of a solemn vow which gives to thousands of pastors, their parish as their only family, their church as their only wife. Her worship is surrounded with pomp and willingly receives the tribute of all the arts; but Catholic festivals are especially sanctified by the humble confession of sins, and by partaking of the table of the Lord. This divine food, the source of all beauty, all purity, all perfection in Christian society, never ceases to bring forth bishops like Charles Borromeo and Alphonsus Ligouri; priests such as Vincent de Paul, Francis Xavier, and Claver; virgins such as Theresa and Catherine of Sienna; martyrs such as Borie, Gagelin, Perboyre, &c. Accordingly the Roman Church has need of a permanent tribunal, before which the right of the Saints to the veneration of the faithful and the authenticity of the miracles performed through their intercession, are discussed with a severity which has been considered excessive even by Protestant critics.

This Church is CATHOLIC (or universal) in her *duration*, which ascends without a break through the Apostles to Jesus Christ, through Jesus Christ to the origin of the chosen people, and through Abraham and the Patriarchs even to the birth-day of the human race. She is Catholic also in *extent*, exceeding both in numbers and in widespread diffusion not merely one sect taken by itself, but all the sects combined, She has representatives throughout the whole world, wherever there are Christians, nay,

we might say, wherever there are men. Twenty years after the ascension of our Saviour the great Apostle wrote to the Christians of Rome, "Your faith is spoken of in the whole world."[1] From her very birth the Church was spread through the great Roman empire, and at the end of the first century she had passed beyond those limits; since that time she has never ceased to gain ground on the barbarians, calling into the vineyard of her Master some at the first hour, others at the third, others still later, but calling all at the hour fixed by the Lord; accustomed to regain in a country still new what she had lost in others that had revolted from her authority, and always seeing the marvellous fecundity of her youth reproducing itself in some part of the world.

The title APOSTOLIC also belongs to her, for she professes the doctrine of the Apostles, whose creed is daily recited by all her children; she exercises the authority of the Apostles, which has been transmitted to her from hand to hand by a lawful mission, blessed and sanctified as in her earliest days by the sacrament of ordination. Thus each one of her pastors can exhibit, in due and good form, his title to the government of souls, signed by Jesus Christ through the hand of his bishop; each bishop can prove his canonical institution received from the successor of Peter, who was established, by Jesus Christ Himself, as the foundation of the whole Church and the shepherd of the whole flock. There is not a break in those glorious genealogies which each Episcopal See, and above all the rest, the See of Peter, can show alike to friends and foes. It is the Apostolic ministry which is perpetuated, under the presidency of the chief of the Apostles, with the perpetual presence and assistance of Him, who promised *to continue with His own even to the consummation of the world.*

Thus the authority of the minister at our altars, depends neither on the temporal prince nor on the people,

[1] Rom. I. 8.

but solely on his chief in the Apostolical hierarchy. Noble independence, which forms the security of the faithful, the greatness of the Church, the dignity of her pontiffs; though as happens from time to time, it makes confessors and martyrs for the faith.

What more could be desired? That this Church should be less persecuted, more widely extended, more fruitful in heroes, more frequently illustrated by miracles? This would be to demand that the sun should be warmer and brighter; that the works of God, which are necessarily finite, should possess a higher degree of perfection. It would be to complain of not seeing in the assembly of the faithful, what, according to the appointment of God, we ought to give it ourselves—that increase of lustre and splendor which every Christian should contribute to it by his holiness and his zeal.

Thus, even before we have been able to verify the claims of the Catholic Society by the test of Scripture and tradition, it appears before us as the one, true Church of God; and when it says to us, "Believe in me," conscience feels constrained to obey, under pain of resisting the infallible authority of God, exercising itself upon us through the ministry of the Church.

This is what a Protestant thinker, still (although it is almost incredible) a minister of a reformed church, expressed in the following terms; "The study of the Catholic system leads us to recognize with ever-increasing clearness that it is logical, that it is beautiful, that the foundations on which it rests are deeply rooted in human nature. . . . I am persuaded that this dilemma may be maintained victoriously. Either Jesus Christ has not organized a Church at all, or the Catholic Church is the one He has organized."[1]

This is what was still more vividly felt by the heart of St. Augustine, and which his grand mind expressed in

[1] Thesis of M. Ernest Naville, Professor at Geneva, 1839.

these words:[1] "How many considerations detain me in the bosom of the Catholic Church! the agreement of so many nations and races; authority begun by miracles, nurtured by hope, strengthened by charity, confirmed by length of time; the succession of Bishops from the chair of the Apostle Peter himself, to whom our Lord after His resurrection entrusted the feeding of His flock, down even to the present Bishop; lastly, the very name Catholic, of which amid so many heresies this Church alone has kept possession;—all this attaches me to her with my inmost soul."

[1] Tenet consensio populorum et gentium ; tenet auctoritas miraculis inchoata, spe nutrita, charitate aucta, vetustate firmata ; tenet ab ipsa sede Petri Apostoli usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum, etc. *Contr. Epist.* Manichœi fundament, c. iv., n. 5.

CHAPTER SECOND.

Proofs of the Authority of the Church.

I.

The authority of the Church confirmed by the testimony of the books which relate to its constitution.

I admit then, on their being proposed to me by my Mother Church,—First, a creed called like herself, Apostolic, in which I learn to acknowledge one only God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and, as a means of uniting us to this great God, the Church herself, holy and Catholic, through which I hope to obtain the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and eternal life.

Afterwards I receive from the same authority certain books which she presents to me as holy, and inspired by the Spirit of God Himself, the genuineness and authenticity of which would be proved to me by science; and there I see at the very outset, with lively satifaction, the outlines of this very Church,—One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman,—of which the living picture is before my eye. The resemblance is so striking, that it is hard to conceive how any one can reject the authority of the Church, without at the same time tearing to pieces the divine Scriptures.

Let us judge by some traits.

Jesus Christ, according to the belief of all the Christians in the world, is the founder and institutor of the Church. Now, out of the multitudes of those who believed in Him, He chose seventy-two disciples, and before these disciples He had appointed twelve Apostles, whom on different occasions He invested with the highest

powers. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."[1] —"All power is given to me in heaven and on earth; going therefore teach ye all nations."[2]—"Preach the Gospel to every creature."[3]—"Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."[4]—"Baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."[5]—"He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me."[6]—"Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."[7]—"Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."[8] Here then, according to the Gospel, we see most clearly a body of pastors receiving from Jesus Christ, that is to say from God Himself, all authority for teaching, governing and administering the sacraments. He, who possesses all power on earth and in heaven, sends them as he was sent Himself, and promises them His assisting presence even to the last day of the world's existence.

But among the twelve Apostles our Saviour distinguished Simon.[9] He begins by giving him a symbolical name: that of Peter; ("Stone" or "Rock");—afterwards giving the reason for this singular denomination, and rewarding the frankness and honesty of his confession of faith, He says:[10] "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in Heaven." The evening before His death, Jesus addressing Himself to Peter and speaking to the twelve, says:[11] "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have

[1] Joan. xx. 21.
[2] Matth. xxxiii. 18.
[3] Marc. xvi. 15.
[4] Matth. xxviii. 20.
[5] Matth. xxviii. 19.
[6] Luc. x. 16.
[7] Matth. xviii. 18.
[8] Joan. xx. 23.
[9] Joan. 1. 42.
[10] Matth. xvi. 18; 19.
[11] Luc. xxii. 31; 32.

you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee," for thee, Peter, "that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, strengthen thy brethren." Finally, after His resurrection, the divine Master bestows all that He had promised. Peter receives the government of the universal Church in virtue of those memorable words which give a worthy recompense of his thrice repeated protestation of love:[1] "Feed My lambs; Feed (be a shepherd to) My lambs; Feed (be a shepherd to) My sheep."

The Church, then, which Jesus Christ thus constituted, must have had from that time forward a body of men teaching, preaching the Gospel, baptizing, remitting sins, governing, in virtue of a divine mission; and, at the head of this body, a supreme pontiff—established as the foundation stone of the building, the pastor of the whole fold, the possessor of the keys of the whole house, the teacher charged with the duty of strengthening his brethren, inasmuch as his faith never was to fail, by virtue of the prayer of Jesus which was certainly heard and granted.

Thus organized, the Church receives from her Founder solemn and explicit promises: "That the powers of hell should never prevail against her."[2] In consequence it is impossible that error should ever obscure her teaching, or vice be encouraged by her moral system. The Incarnate Word promises to be with Peter and His Apostles always, till the end of time;[3] words which most distinctly intimate that the powers of Peter and the Apostles must pass to their legitimate sucessors, since all that is established for the Church must subsist as long as she does; again, He promises His Apostles to send His Spirit to them, "that He may abide with you for ever."[4]

A perfect unity ought to characterize this Church, which Jesus Christ calls a "building,"[5] a "kingdom,"[6] a

[1] Joan. xxi. 15.
[2] Matth. xvi. 18.
[3] Matth. xxviii. 20.
[4] Joan. xiv. 16.
[5] Matth. xvi. 18.
[6] Matth. xvi. 19.

"city,"[1] a "flock,"[2] a "house,"[3] a "body,"[4] for which He asked a unity like that which unites the Three Divine Persons in one and the same Nature.[5] It is in the interest of this precious unity that Simon Peter is established as the foundation of the building, the shepherd of the flock; and that he who refuses to hear the Church is to be regarded "as the heathen and publican."[6]

Sanctity is promised no less than unity. It was to form for Himself a pure Church, "without spot or wrinkle," devoted to good works, that Jesus Christ shed His blood.[7] Besides, sanctity ought to be the result of the true faith, since "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit."[8] Miracles, also according to the promise of our Saviour, ought to *mark the footsteps of true believers.*[9] Nevertheless, the Church is not composed of the elect alone, for it is compared to a net which draws out of the sea, fish both good and bad,[10] to a field where the cockle grows beside the wheat until the day of the harvest.[11]

Again, it is compared to a city built on the top of a hill, visible to all around,[12] to a lamp giving light to the whole house,[13] to a great tree whose branches offer shelter and protection to the birds of the air,[14] to a net filled with one hundred and fifty-three fishes, that is, says St. Jerome, "filled with fish of all kinds." Jesus Christ says positively that the Gospel must be preached in the whole world.[15] So the Church must be Catholic. And the oracles of the Prophets who saw the nations running in crowds to the holy mountain, and kings and queens surrounding the daughter of Sion with their homage, must be fulfilled in her;[16] she is that "small stone cut out of the top of the mountain," not impelled by any human hand, which breaks in pieces and reduces to dust the four great

[1] Matth. v. 14.
[2] Joan. x. 16.
[3] Matth. vii. 24.
[4] 1 Cor. xii. 13.
[5] Joan. xvii. 11.
[6] Matth. xviii. 17.
[7] Eph. v. 27; Tit. ii. 14.
[8] Matth. vii. 18.
[9] Marc. xvi. 17.
[10] Matth. xiii. 47.
[11] Matth. xiii. 30.
[12] Matth. v. 14.
[13] Matth. v. 15.
[14] Matth. xiii. 32.
[15] Matth. xxiv. 14.
[16] Is. xlix. and lx.

mountains, and "becomes a great mountain which fills the whole earth."[1]

Lastly, since Jesus Christ continues with his Apostles "till the end of time," and Peter, the first Bishop of Rome, is established as the foundation of the Church and its supreme head, it is clear that this Church must be Apostolic and Roman.

Thus the gospels give us complete information as to the institution, organization, authority, and characteristics of the true Church of Christ, and this information coincides with the facts that are present before our eyes. If now we open the Apostolic books, which, one and the same with the Gospels, are a part of the collection alike proposed to our veneration, we shall see Peter and the Apostles enter into possession of the authority conferred on them by Jesus Christ.

The Apostles teach and preach the Gospel—they baptize—they impose hands—they found churches and give them pastors—all, without their right being contested by any one: they provide a successor for Judas, and in the Council of Jerusalem regulate all that concerns faith and discipline, expressing their decision in this form of words: "It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[2] Does a difficulty arise? They resolve it. A scandal? They repress it; and if the guilty person merit it, he is delivered over to Satan, that is, excommunicated, till by his repentance he merits pardon and indulgence.

As to teachers without mission, who already exist and trouble the Church, they give orders that Christians should avoid them, and should have no intercourse with them.[3] As to *oral traditions*, they wish them to be respected equally with their written instructions.[4] They declare in express terms that the Church is founded upon the Apostolic ministry;[5] that Jesus Christ appointed apostles, pastors, doctors, in a word, a teaching and gov-

[1] Dan. ii. 34, [3] Tit. iii. 10, and 2 Thess. iii. 6; 14.
[2] Act xv. 28. [4] 2 Thess. ii. 14. [5] Ephes. ii. 20.

erning body, to carry out the work of the sanctification of the elect, that "we be not carried about with every wind of doctrine."[1] They say, moreover, that the "Holy Ghost has appointed Bishops to rule the Church of God,"[2] "the Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth."[3] According to them the reading of the sacred books "is profitable" to those especially who "teach and reprove" others;[4] yet that they contain difficult passages, "which the unlearned wrest" from their true sense "to their own destruction."[5]

Thus we see that whatever is done before our eyes by the Catholic Episcopate was first practised by the Apostles. It is after the example of the Apostles that our Bishops teach—that they in the first instance decide on points of faith—that they make use of the imposition of hands, whether to confer the Holy Ghost, or to exalt to the grade of the Priesthood; it is after their example that they govern, punish, excommunicate, grant indulgences, recommend the faithful not to maintain dangerous intimacies with heretics; it is in accordance with the Apostolic example that they assemble in Council, where they draw up regulations, not only as to the faith but as to discipline, and that, too, in the name of the Holy Ghost, who has promised them His assisting presence; it is after this example that they teach that apostolic traditions ought to be respected, and that the reading of the sacred Books, useful as it is to the members of the teaching body, presents difficulties and dangers to minds which are not enlightened or not of a teachable disposition; it is after the example of the great Apostle that each of our Bishops says that he is "appointed by the Holy Spirit" to the government of his Church.

But let us see Peter take possession of the authority which was to reside in him until the consummation of ages—consequently in him and in his successors. After

[1] Ephes. iv. 12, 14. [3] 1 Tim. iii. 15. [5] 2 Peter iii. 16.
[2] Act xx. 28. [4] 2 Tim. iii. 16.

the Resurrection of our Saviour who appeared to him first of all the Apostles, Peter is the first to proclaim that Resurrection to all the people, and he confirms the truth of his testimony by a miracle.[1] After the Ascension of Jesus it is Peter who assembles the other Apostles and some disciples in the Upper Chamber, and lays his opinion before them in these terms: "The Scripture must needs be fulfilled" which foretells the defection of Judas, and his place being taken by another; and consequently we must choose one among us, who has been a witness of the miracles and resurrection of the Son of God, to take his place.[2] *Must* the Gospel be preached to the Gentiles? It is to Peter that the solution of this difficulty is revealed; it is he who decides, "all holding their peace and giving glory to God;"[3] and it is he who first receives the Gentiles into the Church,[4] after having been the first to introduce the Jews into its sacred fold. At a later period the question of circumcision and the ceremonies of the law is agitated; at once Peter *rises up*, he explains and interprets the common faith; all the multitude listen in silence, and the decree is made which fixes forever the faith on this important question. Paul, sent by Jesus Christ Himself to Ananias, to learn of him all that he should do, is eager to go to Jerusalem, to see, not James the Bishop of that city, but Peter: and to see him, says S. John Chrysostom, to study and contemplate in him a greater and more ancient disciple than himself. Peter visits the establishments of Joppa, Lydda, Galilee, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, etc.[5] Everywhere he founds Churches and visits them all with the authority of a general, who reviews his army.[6] From Jerusalem he goes to Antioch, from Antioch to Rome, where after having combatted the heresy of Simon the Magician, he finally seals with his blood and crowns by his martyrdom his glorious Apostleship.

[1] Act. ii. 14, and iii. 15. [2] Act. i. 16. [3] Act. xi. 18 [4] Act. x. [5] Acts ix. [6] S. John Chrysostom.

Thus in imitation of the Prince of the Apostles, the Sovereign Pontiff decides without appeal matters of faith, convokes, presides over, and confirms General Councils, founds churches, visits them by himself or others, appoints Bishops, confirms them in the faith and acts in all as the supreme head of the Catholic Church. Peter took possession for himself and successors of all the duties and prerogatives of the Sovereign Pontificate.

The Church taught and governed by Peter and the Apostles, differs not in its essential character from the Church taught and governed in our days by the Pope and Bishops. We see, in the Acts of the Apostles, the first faithful, deprived of the holy books for they were not yet written, "persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, communion and prayer;"[1] accepting without difficulty the decisions pronounced as well on faith as on discipline;[2] confessing their faults;[3] receiving the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands;[4] strengthened in their sickness by extreme unction.[5] Some are promoted to the priesthood,[6] many practise the evangelical counsels, have all things in common or live in perpetual chastity, after having relinquished all for their Lord;[7] all profess a religious veneration for the person of Peter, and when he is in prison, prayer is made without ceasing for his deliverance.[8] As a reward for their faith God is pleased to work miracles by the shadow of the Chief of the Apostles,[9] and by the linen which had been worn by Paul.[10] Farther, the Christians honor the remains of the first martyr;[11] they choose Sunday for the day of their united prayer and for making a collection for the poor;[12] they recommend themselves to each other's prayers. They practise certain purifications for the dead;[13] they are exhorted to good works as necessary to salvation, and carefully guard-

[1] Acts ii. 42.
[2] Acts xv. 14, 31, 41.
[3] Ib. xix. 18,
[4] Ib. viii. 17.
[5] James v. 14.
[6] Tit. i. 5.
[7] Act. ii. 44, 45; 1 Cor. vii. 7; Matth. xix. 27.
[8] Act. xii. 5.
[9] Act. v. 15.
[10] Act. xix. 12.
[11] Act. viii. 2.
[12] Act. xx. 7; 1 Cor xvi. 2.
[13] 1 Cor. xv. 29.

ed against being seduced by teachers who have no mission, &c., &c. Thus in the picture of the Church of Jesus Christ traced out by St. Luke, St. Paul, St James, and the others, you find all the features, all the physiognomy of the Church that is called—one, holy Catholic, Apostolic and Roman.

Still more. It is only necessary to run over the Books of the Old Testament, especially Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, to establish the fact that the Jewish Church, called by the Evangelists and the Apostles the *shadow* and the *figure* of the Christian society, can in fact be the shadow and figure of the Catholic Church alone. In the Jewish system there is one visible head, Moses, continuing to live on in the Sovereign Pontiffs, the successive High Priests, who sat in his chair. This head presides over a complete hierarchy, to which entire obedience is due under the severest penalties. These priests teach with authority, explain the law, preserve the traditions, maintain the practice of morality, pray and offer sacrifices,—in a word govern the religious society. In these features who cannot recognize Jesus Christ still living for the government of the Catholic Church in Peter and his successors, the Roman Pontiffs presiding over the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, over the authority, the consecration and the functions of the priests of the new Law? If Christ is come "not to destroy the law but to carry it to perfection,"[1] all that is imperfect in the synagogue ought to be perfect in the Church: High Priesthood, Sacraments, Sacrifice, &c., &c. This perfection of the Law we perceive throughout the Catholic system; Protestants can find in theirs only *the law destroyed.* Nothing in the history of the people of God is so like their defection, as the schism of the Samaritans.

[1] *Non veni legem solvere sed adimplere.* Matth. v. 17.—See *l'Harmonie de l' Eglise et de la Synagogue,* by M. Drach. *The Analogia Veteris et Novi Testamenti,* by Becanus.

II.

The authority of the Church confirmed by its whole history.

This One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, who proves her divine institution and authority by superhuman characteristics such as these which have dazzled us by their splendor, and who to confirm our faith, makes us read in her archives the title-deeds of her property and the history of her being put in possession of it by the God-man Himself, can also say to us with truth: The authority which I possess at present, and which I received and displayed from the very beginning, I have at all times exercised in the Christian world.

That there is in the Church of their time an hierarchical authority, established by Jesus Christ to preserve His doctrine, His moral teaching, His worship, His institutions, and that the Bishop of Rome, the sovereign Pontiff and successor of St. Peter, is placed at the head of this hierarchy,—is just what is told us with a unanimous voice, and repeated from century to century by Fathers, Doctors, Saints, Bishops, Popes, particular and general Councils, emperors, kings, and the greater part of even heretics.

St. Clement Pope, St. Ignatius Martyr, St. Cyprian, Tertullian and Origen, who witness to the faith of the first centuries, affirm that Jesus Christ, in the interest of unity, and to secure the preservation and well being of the Christian community, established in the person of His Apostles, a power vested with a legitimate and sacred authority, for the government of the Church, and that this power passed from the Apostles to bishops appointed by them, and was preserved in their successors. They conclude from this that the bishops are the representatives of Jesus Christ; that on this ground the faithful owe them obedience; that it belongs to them to resolve questions of faith and morals, to administer true and real sacraments, to settle the canon of the divine Scriptures;

that it is through them that we are in the Church, and that the Church itself subsists and can be with certainty known as such.[1]

Peter established by Christ as head of the Apostolic College, having ultimately fixed his abode and his see at Rome and there consummated his martyrdom, Rome was called by the Fathers, the Doctors and Saints of all ages, the See of Peter—and the Bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter—and the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, the supremacy of Peter—and communion with Rome, communion with Peter.[2]

This fact of St. Peter's residence at Rome, in its own nature a sensible, palpable fact, easy to verify, since it lasted five and twenty years, and must have interested not only the whole Christian world, but all those Jews and Gentiles, who were urged to embrace the faith; this fact, attested by an unvarying and universal testimony, which was transmitted by oral tradition and consigned to numberless written works; writings of Fathers (St. Cyprian, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. Athanasius, &c.); writings of historians, (St. Irenæus, St. Epiphanius, Eusebius, St. Isidore); writings of sovereign Pontiffs and of Councils (Councils of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, of Lyons, of Florence, &c.); this fact celebrated every year in the whole Church by festivals, such as that of the chair of St. Peter at Rome, the chains worn by St. Peter at Rome; recalled

[1] St. Clem. *Ep.* 1. *ad Cor.* c. 42–44. St. Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* c. 8, 9. St. Iren. *adv. Hier.* 1. iii. and iv. 26. St. Cyprian. *Epist.* xxv, xxvii, lxix. Tertull. *de Præscr.* xxxii. *et alibi.* Origen in *Matth. Hom.* xvi. et passim; in Luc. *Hom.* xviii; in *Exod. Hom.* 1; *in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. v. St. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* l. vi. n. 17. St. Augustin. *Contra Faustum*, l. xvii, xxxii. c. 6. 1 *Cont. adv. leg. et Prophet.* lib. 1. c. xx. n. 39.

[2] Orig *in Exod. Hom.* v. n. 4. St. Epiphan. *in Anchora*, n. 9. Tertull *de Præscr.* c. xxii. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* lv. and lix. St. Jerome, *Epist.* xiv. *ad Damas. & Dial. adv. Lucifer.* Athanas. *Epist. ad Felicen Papam.* St. Leo, *Serm.* 1, 8; iv. 1–4. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. ii. 14 and 15; and l. iii.; and *Dem. Evang.* iii. 7.. St. Chrysos. *Hom.* lv. *in Matth. n.* 2.

to the remembrance of all future ages by the erection of magnificent temples, by the concourse of the faithful unceasingly renewed around the tomb of the prince of the Apostles; this fact, the indispensable foundation of the pre-eminence of the See of Rome, which the see of Antioch, occupied for a time by St. Peter, never disputed with it; this fact, the only possible explanation of the history of the Roman Church and of the whole of Christendom; this fact, in fine, which no one can deny without at the same time affirming that the constitution of the Church made by Jesus Christ was overthrown at the very beginning, and that irremediably, by a monstrous imposition of which the whole world has been the dupe, and in which God Himself has not shrunk from appearing as an accomplice;—this fact has been defended against odious attacks by Protestants themselves, cited in the Bible of Vence (Dissertation on St. Peter's journey to Rome), in Foggini,[1] and quite recently in the fourth letter of Father Ventura to the minister Taillefer. We may mention among others Calvin,[2] Grotius,[3] Cave, Hammond, Pearson, Usher, Chamier, Blondel, Scaliger, Casaubon, P. Dumoulin, Neander, Gieseler,[4] &c.

St. Ignatius (Martyr) attributes to the Church of Rome among other prerogatives, supremacy.[5] "Every church," says St. Ireneus, "that is, the faithful spread through the whole world, ought to resort to and consequently agree with the Church of Rome, because of its primacy. It is she who has preserved the tradition of the Apostles, for the advantage of the whole world." Just before, he had called the Church of Rome the greatest, the most ancient

[1] *De Rom. Petri itinere et Episcopatu.*

[2] Propter scriptorum consensum non pugno quin Romæ mortuus fuerit Petrus. (Instit. L. iv. c. vi. n. 15.)

[3] Petrum Romæ fuisse nemo verus Christianus dubitabit. (In 1 Petr. v. 13.)

[4] He designates the opposite assertion as arising from controversial and party spirit.

[5] In the address of his Epistle to the Romans.

church, universally known, founded by the "Apostles Peter and Paul."[1] St. Cyprian calls Rome the chair of Peter, and the principal church, whence the unity of the Priesthood takes its rise.[2]

It is the consciousness of their right and of their duty which leads the sovereign Pontiffs at all times to act as supreme head of the church; for instance, St. Clement in the schism of the Corinthians, Pope Victor in the question of Easter, St. Stephen in that of re-baptizing, St. Cornelius in that of Novatus, St. Dionysius in that of Paul of Samosata. The heresies of Arius, of Apollinaris, of Nestorius, of Eutyches, threaten the faith of the Church; the Popes always rise up in its defence. Their words are in accordance with their acts; they claim supreme authority over the whole Church. Anacletus, Victor I., Zephyrinus, &c., call before their tribunal the most difficult causes, those especially in which bishops are parties interested.

St. Julius I., in concert with the Bishops assembled in council at Rome, A. D. 342, wrote thus to the accusers of St. Athanasius. "If Athanasius and Marcellus (bishop of Anityro, driven from his see by the Arians) were in fault, you ought to have written to us, that we might have pronounced sentence. Do you not know that this is the usage, that we should first be written to, that so what is right should be decided here? . . . But now, without having informed us, and having done what they themselves chose, they wish us to approve what they have thought fit to do. Such were not the ordinances of Paul, nor the traditions of our fathers; this is a new method of proceeding, a new institution. What I now declare to you is, what we have received from the blessed

[1] The following is the text of St. Irenæus, against Heresies, lib. iii. c. 3, n. 2. "Ad hanc Ecclesiam, (*which he had just called* maxima, antiquissima, omnibus cognita, ab Apostolis Petro et Paulo, fundata,) propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio."

[2] Cyprian, Epist. lv., ad com.

Apostle St. Peter, and I considered them to have been so well known to you all that I should not have written them had I not been astonished at your conduct."[1]

St. Gregory (in 590) annuls the decisions of a general council which he had himself convoked in Africa, because he judged several of them to be contrary to the laws of the Church. Pope Adrian I., with the approbation of the second Council of Nice,[2] declares (about the year 787) that "St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, who first occupied the Apostolic See, transmitted by the command of God, to the pontiffs who even to the end of time (perenniter) should occupy his see, his primacy in the Apostolate and in the pastoral charge, and all the authority which he had received from God our Saviour." It is certain, writes Nicholas I. to Photius (in 860)[3] "that the holy Roman Church is the head over all the churches, through the blessed St. Peter who was thought worthy to receive the primacy of the churches from the Saviour's own mouth, ... accordingly, it is necessary, without opposing custom or self-will, to hold with unshaken firmness all that the pontiffs who occupy this see ordain by virtue of their plenary authority." The same Pontiff writes to the Emperor Michael:[4] "The Roman Church confirms by its authority the acts of councils. Such as have not obtained the assent of the Roman Pontiff are invalid. The Canons have ordered that appeals may be made to his authority from all parts of the Church, but that none can appeal from this tribunal to any other." And in 1053 Leo IX. wrote to Michael, the patriarch of Constantinople:[5] "Has not the church of Rome, the see of the prince of the Apostles, reproved, vanquished and destroyed all heresies, whether by Peter in person, or by his successors; and confirmed in the faith of Peter, which

[1] Epist. S. Julii Papæ ad Eusebium, n. 21. Vide Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 15; and Sozom. l. iii. c. 8.

[2] Labbe, t. vii. p. 99. [3] Ibid, t. viii. p. 282. [4] Ibid, t. viii. p. 293.

[5] Ibid, t. ix. p. 949.

never has failed and which never will fail, the faith of his brethren? . . . . The holy pope Sylvester," he goes on, "decreed with the assent both oral and written of his spiritual son, the religious Constantine, and of the Council of Nice, that the chief see should not be judged by any one . . . the first Council of Constantinople, with the consent of Theodosius, the first Council of Ephesus, under Theodosius the younger, the Council of Chalcedon under Marcian, the third of Constantinople, at the prayer of Constantine the younger,—confirmed by word of mouth, in writing and by unanimous consent, this truth: That the holy and Apostolic see of Rome is, after Jesus Christ our Lord, the Head of all the churches of God."

The Greeks, in 1274,[1] subscribe this profession of faith which is presented to them by Gregory X: "The holy Roman Church possesses a supreme and complete primacy and authority over the whole Catholic Church. She acknowledges truly and humbly that she received it, together with plenary authority from the Saviour himself, in the person of Peter, the prince or head of the Apostles; of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor; and as she is bound more than the other churches to defend the truth of religion, so if any questions arise respecting the faith, they ought to be determined by her judgment. Whoever considers himself wronged in any matter which pertains to the Church can appeal to her tribunal, and in all the causes which respect ecclesiastical jurisdiction recourse may be had to her judgment. All churches are subject to her, and the prelates who govern them owe respect and obedience to her. The plenitude of power belongs to her in such sort that the other churches are admitted by her to a share in her solicitude. Several of these, especially the Patriarchal churches, have been honored with various privileges by the Roman Church, without prejudice to her prerogatives, which she must preserve whether in general councils or in certain other cases."

[1] Labbe, t. xi. p. 965.

"To be subject to the Sovereign Pontiff of Rome is necessary to salvation for all Christians," says Pope Leo X.,[1] in the fifth Council of Lateran (in 1516), as we are taught by the testimony of the divine Scriptures, of the holy Fathers, and the constitution of our predecessor, Boniface VIII., which begins with the words: "Unam sanctam."

The Bishops of the whole world acknowledge and venerate this supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff in teaching, administration, and government. St. Ambrose, St. Cyril, St. Peter Chrysologus, &c.,[2] hold that the Pope takes care of the whole Church; that he should be informed of all that passes in it, and that his decisions should be obeyed. So St. Dionysius of Corinth refers the question of the rebaptizers to St. Xystus; St. Basil asks of St. Damasus the excommunication of Marcellus; other bishops of the East have recourse to the same Pope in order to obtain the extirpation of Arianism, and the deposition of those who favor Apollinarius. They denounce the heresy of Nestorius to St. Celestine, that of Eutyches to St. Leo. Nicholas I. is consulted by a great number of bishops, who accept his solution of their doubts. For all the churches of Christendom regard the teaching of Rome as the pure doctrine of the Apostles, and the judgments that have emanated from Rome as the judgment of Peter, which ought to be sufficient to put an end to all disputes, and to resolve all difficulties.[3]

The councils declare: at Nice, "That the Roman Church has always had the pre-eminence;" at Sardica, "that if a deposed bishop appeals to Rome, no one ought to be put in his place till the Bishop of Rome has given his deci-

[1] Labbe, t. xiv. p. 309.

[2] St. Ambrose, *Epist.* lvi. *ad Theoph.* n. 7. St. Cyril, *Epist. ad Celestin*, t. v. p. ii. 2. St. Peter Chrysologus, *Epist. ad Eutych. Max. Bibl. Patrum.* vii. 979.

[3] St. Irenæus, cited above. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* lv. St. Basil, *Epist.* lxx. St. Jerome, *Epist.* xiv. *ad Damasum. Epist.* lix. *ad Theoph.* St. Augustine, *Cont. Jul.* lib. i. c. iv. n. 13. *de Peccato Orig.* c. viii. etc.

sion;" at Ephesus, "that Peter lives and always will live in his successors, and judges by them;" at Chalcedon, "that Peter has always preserved the truth without any admixture of error;" at Florence, "that the Holy Apostolic see of the Roman pontiff has the supremacy over the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, that he is the true Vicar of Jesus Christ, and the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that in the person of St. Peter plenary authority was given him by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, direct and govern the universal church, as it is contained in the acts of the œcumenical Councils and in the sacred Canons." And this decree of the council of Florence is subscribed not by the Latins only, but by the Greeks, the Armenians, the Jacobites, the Maronites, &c., &c. The Council of Trent expresses itself like the council of Nice: it calls the power of the Sovereign Pontiff *supreme;* it defines that the faithful of whatever dignity they be, Kings or Emperors, Bishops, Primates or Patriarchs, owe him a real and true obedience. It declares that it pertains to him to provide the churches with Pastors; to determine the impediments which make marriage null and to dispense with them; to convoke a general council, to confirm its decrees, to resolve the doubts raised by them; to create Cardinals; to appoint Bishops; to watch over the reform of studies; to correct the abuses which might be introduced into the dispensing of indulgences; to proceed against non-resident prelates; to decide the most grave causes in which Bishops were concerned; to judge of the validity of the grounds which dispensed with their residence. He can reserve to himself the absolving from certain grave crimes, absolve those who have possessed themselves of ecclesiastical property; without his judgment nothing unusual can be established in the Church.[1]

Princes and emperers themselves, Aurelian while still

[1] See the index of the Council of Trent and the other Councils.

a pagan, Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian I and II, Anastasius II, Valentinian III, Marcian, Phocas, &c., acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Bishops of Rome;[1] what is more, the Franks ask for a king from Pope Zacharias; the kings of the Visigoths submit to St. Gregory the Great; the Armenians and the Maronites to Lucius III, &c.

It is the sentiment of this superior authority which leads the heretics of the first ages, as Marcion, Praxeas, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Donatists, to seek their justification in a false appearance of being in communion with Rome. Theodoret, when accused of heresy, appeals to St. Leo who acquits him. Donatus, Cæcilian, Pelagius, Nestorius, also endeavor to exculpate themselves from the charge of heresy by addressing their defence to the sovereign Pontiff. Photius and Michael Cerularius extol the authority of the Holy See, so long as by means of their praise, their obedience to it can be dispensed with. M. de Maistre has confirmed their testimonies by a crowd of others emanating from the Greek and Russian Churches.[2] Those of the principal doctors of the Armenian Church may be seen in Galanus. As to the so-called Reformers, their leaders themselves and their most distinguished thinkers—Luthur, Calvin, Melancthon, Casaubon, Grotius, Puffendorf, Leibnitz, &c., have rendered valuable homage to the supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ; this testimony has been collected by the Protestants, Hæninghaus and the Baron de Starck; and by the Catholics, Barruel, Esslinger, &c.[3]

Among true Christians there is, therefore, but one voice as to the authority of the Church and its head.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. vii. c. 30. Ammian Marcellian. l. xv. St. Leo. *Epist.* xi. and cx.

[2] *Du Pape.* l. i. ch. 10.

[3] Hæninghaus *La Reforme contre la Reforme.* De Starck, *Banquet Theodule.* Barruel *du Pape,* Part 2. c. 5. Esslinger *Entretiens d'un ministre Protestant converti.* Append. 2 to the 9th *Conversation.*

III.

Conclusions of the first two chapters.

To sum up what has been said: the Lord has the authority of His infallible word over us; in virtue of that authority, which is founded on His truth and His faithfulness, He can oblige us to believe certain truths the revelation of which He judges useful for our guidance. Faith is the docile assent given to such a truth received from on high.

Private judgment may establish the fact of the revelation, or rather the obligation of believing it when brought home to the conscience of the unbeliever; it cannot, without presumption, discuss the intrinsic truth of the divine declarations.

The authority of God as revealed may be exercised in our regard either immediately, or by the intervention of an envoy and the ministry of a teaching Church.

A fixed determination not to believe in any Church, even though we see the distinctive marks of a supernatural institution beaming resplendently forth in a religious society, would be culpable *incredulity:* to believe in a sect which exhibted none of these characteristics would be blind and miserable *credulity.* But to believe in the one, ancient Church, which justifies by its superhuman credentials the obligation it imposes on us of admitting its authority, this is the reasonable obedience which constitutes *faith.*

The One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church unites all the distinguishing characteristics of divine institutition and mission. The fact of her superhuman existence is, therefore, of itself alone a sufficient foundation and justification of the obligation which she imposes on us of believing her teaching, her creed, her Scriptures.

In going over the inspired books which give the history of her institution, and her organization, and of the promises which were made to her, we are confirmed in our

faith by perceiving a perfect identity between the divine work of Christ and the Catholic Society, such as it now exists before our eyes.

This same faith is still further strengthened by the study of history, which shows us the Church of all times uniformly resembling alike the institution of the Saviour of mankind and her present constitution.

These data would undoubtedly be sufficient to prove the truth of the dogmas which the Catholic Church proposes for our belief, most especially in the last of her general councils, where all the points of doctrine which are controverted between Catholics and Protestants were discussed and defined. However, to anticipate any difficulties, to dissipate all doubts, to throw a still clearer light on the divine object of our belief, we shall demonstrate in the chapters that follow the authority of the Council of Trent, and also the lawfulness, wisdom, and usefulness to the individual Christian and to society, of each of its definitions.

CHAPTER THIRD.

On the Authority of the Council of Trent.

First, second and third Sessions.

I.

On Councils in General.

In the fifteenth chapter of the Acts we read the history of the first Council. Some pious Christians maintain that it was still necessary to observe certain very burdensome practices of the old Law. The Apostles, and with them some priests or bishops,[1] warned of this by Paul and Barnabas, assemble at Jerusalem. They discuss the question carefully; they consult the Scriptures; they invoke the aid of the Spirit of God. St. Peter is the first to speak with authority; as the chief of all and president of the Council. His address is followed by deep silence which evidences the respectful assent of the assembly.[2] After him, the Apostles Barnabas, Paul and James, express the grounds of their adhesion. They agree unanimously on the terms of the decree, the promulgation of which is entrusted to Judas and Silas, and in which these memorable words occur: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." The reading of this canon, which at the same time concerned doctrine and discipline, fills the faithful at Antioch with consolation and joy; Paul, accompanied by Silas, and *delivered by the brethren to the grace of God*, go thence throughout the churches, commanding them to receive the precepts of the Apostles and

[1] See the proof and explanation of this synonym in Petavius, *Dissert Eccles.* l. i. c. i. and 2; in Bellarmine, *De Concilio*, l. i. c. 15 and 16, *in Perrone, De Ordine*, n. 104.

[2] Tacuit omnis multitudo, Act. xv. 12.

bishops with docility and submission: and the condemned Judaizers submit.

Since that time eighteen general Councils have followed the example of the Council of Jerusalem. Their assembling was occasioned by errors that had to be dissipated or abuses to be put down. The successor of Peter, warned by vigilant pastors, called together to the place judged most suitable, the successors of the Apostles and first bishops. He presided in person or by his legates over this great labor of inquiring into Scripture and tradition. Assisted by those to whom Jesus Christ said: "Teach the nations . . . He that heareth you heareth me . . . I am with you always even unto the consummation of the world;" the head of the Apostolic body, the possessor[1] of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the shepherd of the lambs and the sheep, the teacher whose faith cannot fail, and who is to strengthen his brethren, the foundation of a building against which the powers of hell shall never prevail, the sovereign Pontiff established and announced to the whole world, by a formal declaration, that such is the doctrine to be believed, such the law to be observed. It was the duty of all to acquiesce and obey; and while the reading of the Apostolic decree filled the multitude of the faithful[2] with consolation and joy, those who were obstinately refractory were cut off from the Church and put under the ban of Christendom.

Thus the first Council of Nice condemned Arianism; the council of Ephesus, Nestorianism, which renewed in a milder form the impiety of Arius. The council of Chalcedon anathematized Eutyches, who, falling into an opposite extreme, denied the human nature of the Word made flesh. The first general council of Constantinople defined the divinity of the Holy Ghost, against Macedonius, who had been bishop of that metropolis. The third council assembled in that city condemned the Monothelites, &c.,

[1] Cum autem magna conquisitio fieret. *Acts.* xv. 7.

[2] Quam cum legissent, gavisi sunt super consolatione, *Act.* v. 31.

&c. And all these condemnations or definitions were considered as judgments of the universal Church, invested with the authority and assisted by the presence of the Holy Spirit of God: St. Paul had said, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema." The Councils employed the same formula against those who endeavored to destroy the holy unanimity of faith.

In the eyes of all a general Council represents the entire teaching Church. It represents the supreme head of the Church, since it is he who convokes it, presides over it, confirms and executes its decrees. It represents the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, since they are all convoked, heard and called to judge. It represents the sacerdotal order, secular and regular, the auxiliary of the Episcopate; for it is from priests and religious that the Bishops choose their theologians and their councillors. The distinctive characteristics of the Church of Jesus Christ nowhere appear with more lustre than in these holy assemblies: its *unity*, in the union of all the members to the same head; its *sanctity*, in the extirpation of errors and abuses; its *Catholicity*, in convoking the pastors of the whole christian world; its *Apostolicity*, in the acknowledgment of the authority of tradition, and the confirmation given to the doctrine of the Apostles.

It evidently belongs to the divinely constituted head of the Episcopate to convoke the bishops and to preside over their assembly in person or by his representatives; and the proposition of the modern Reformers to accept as judge only a council from which the Pope was excluded, was as novel as it was revolting and absurd. The Christian Emperors never presided over an Œcumenical Council; and if they sometimes charged themselves with the care of convoking them it was because they alone at that period could defray the attendant expenses. In such cases the ecclesiastical authority authorized or allowed them to do so.

All Bishops, as enjoying an equal right, ought to be

alike called to a general Council. No one should be excluded except he be a heretic or a schismatic. They can bring with them theologians, who shall have only a consultative voice; but never before the sixteenth century did the world see the right of sitting in a council as judges, claimed for emperors, kings, princes, counts, barons, and in general for all the learned and pious men who believed they had a right to take part in it.[1] Jurien himself acknowledged that such an assembly by its very nature, and any deliberation whatever in such a crowd, were physically impossible.

It is even impossible that all the bishops of the world should be assembled in a council. It is sufficient that a certain number be present; the absent being considered to adhere in advance to all the decisions definitely formed by the council as such and approved by the Pope.

If there is a question of judging persons in a council, it is simply fair that they should be heard; but if the judgment is to be passed on their doctrines, it is sufficient that such doctrines be represented by faithful extracts from their works.

The duty of all the Christians of the world is to submit to the judgment pronounced by the council. It is even in order to obtain a more prompt and easy submission that the head of the Episcopate appeals to his brethren; but very rarely, perhaps never, has it been seen, that those who gave occasion to these solemn discussions have all accepted the solution of them. Thus the Nestorians did not submit to the council of Ephesus, nor the Eutychians to that of Chalcedon, &c. However, though it is indispensable to adhere to a definition of faith, it is not in the same degree necessary for salvation to accept a rule of discipline. Faith being necessarily one, invariable, revealed by God, obligatory on all minds, cannot be rejected without incurring the guilt of heresy; discipline, on the

[1] Such however was the proposition seriously proposed by the States of Germany. See Prompsault, n. 139.

other hand, being subject to variation according to times and places, and determined in its details by the sole authority of the Church, obliges without doubt, but not under pain of excommunication and schism, unless the Church insists on its execution under such a penalty. Therefore it may happen that a General Council which must necessarily be admitted by all the Catholics of the world in everything relating to dogma and morals, may not be received in all its regulations of discipline by some Bishops, who under different pretexts refuse to put them in execution,—not without incurring the guilt of a formal act of disobedience, but without being expelled from the pale of the Church for this act alone.

II.

The Convocation of the Council of Trent.—The liberty it enjoyed.—Its acceptance by the Church.

The eighteenth general Council terminated at Trent, on the 4th of December, 1563, and was confirmed on the 26th of January following, by a Bull of Pius IV. It had been eagerly and urgently called for by the whole Church, but it was held under the most difficult circumstances, and amid innumerable obstacles.

The Turks, masters of Rhodes, kept in check Italy, Hungary, Austria. The principle sovereigns of Europe—Charles V, Henry VIII, Francis I—instead of defending Christendom against its deadly enemies, were continually engaged in struggles with each other. But the war of opinion which divided the minds of men, was yet more cruel than either civil discord or foreign aggression.

That ascendancy which during the middle ages the Church had employed for the benefit of temporal society, was repudiated by a terrible reaction which invaded the spiritual domain and wished to subject it to the State. Princes and chief nobles, courtiers and lawyers, entered in great numbers upon this course of encroachment. The

clergy were rich and envied in consequence: they were assailed by all the temptations of fortune, and by a multiplicity of avocations which had but little of a supernatural character. Accordingly the sale of the church property had already been resolved on in France, and seriously discussed in Spain.[1] At the courts of princes the collation of ecclesiastical benefices had become the subject of a disgraceful traffic, which multiplied among the ranks of God's ministers the agents of a hostile power and even the followers of heterodox opinions. The collection of tithes, the recovery of quit-rents, and other ecclesiastical revenues could no longer be made without opposition. Add to this that ignorance, superstition, the love of gain, the great number of clandestine alliances which existed, had in different places introduced into the Christian worship habits and abuses which were loudly but in vain disavowed by bishops and councils.

At this time Luther arose in Germany, Calvin in France, Zuinglius in Switzerland, Henry VIII in England, Gustavus Vasa in Sweden; all of whom under the specious pretext of reforming the Church, labored with a deplorable degree of success for its overthrow.

To pious souls they promised a return to the fervor of primitive Christianity; to proud intellects the liberty of private judgment; to the enemies of the clergy the division of their spoils; to priests and monks, who endured with difficulty the yoke of continence, the abolition of a law, which some proclaimed to be contrary to nature; to libertines of all classes the suppression of fasting, abstinence and confession, and liberty of divorce. They said to kings, that they would be freed from that spiritual authority, which claimed a right to lord it over them; to nobles, that they would see a rival order humbled and impoverished; to the middle classes and the vassals of the Church, that they would be emancipated from all dues and forced services.

[1] Prompsault, n. 21.

Several princes of Germany and some of the Swiss cantons supported by arms the preachers of the new doctrines. Henry VIII imposed his dogmas on his subjects, reserving for himself a morality, as cruel as it was lax. The king of Sweden drew his whole people into apostacy. The court of Navarre eagerly welcomed the Calvinists; that of France secretly favored them.

It was while these ruins were accumulating on all sides that Paul III. convoked, first at Mantua, then at Vicenza, and ultimately at Trent, the œcumenical council, to which the innovators had appealed.

The bull of convocation, dated the 14th of March, 1542, is addressed to all the Catholic Bishops; it obliges them all to come to the council in person, or to make known the causes which prevent them from attending. It also invites all Christian Princes, even the Protestants, to come to it, for which purpose passports are offered for themselves as well as for their theologians.[1]

To this appeal what is the answer? Henry VIII. replies that he will never intrust the work of reforming religion in his kingdom to any one, but will reserve it to himself. The Protestant princes of Germany tell the legate of the Holy See, that they depend on no one but the Emperor; in him alone they recognize the right of convoking legitimate councils. The Viceroy of Naples will only allow four bishops to go from his dominions, charged with the proxies of all the rest; an unheard of claim against which the Pope protested by a bull. The King of France sends only three prelates whom he recalls almost immediately. Charles V. makes his choice also, and presents his difficulties; and when the council does not progress according to his views, ceases not to raise embarrassments and put obstacles in its way. Gustavus Vasa allows no one to come. Lastly, the bishops of Germany and Switzerland, as they could not with prudence leave their dioceses at the moment when the innovators

[1] Prompsault, n. 348.

were laboring to withdraw their subjects from their obedience, were obliged to remain at their posts.

In spite of these first difficulties which were the presage of so many others, forty-three bishops, accompanied by twenty theologians, assembled for the first Session. They were from France, Germany, Spain, England and even from Sweden, but mostly from Italy, where they enjoyed greater freedom. This number was becoming more considerable from day to day; but its increase was prevented by the plague which devastated the adjoining countries and was introduced into Trent.

Trent, a free town, on the confines of Italy, France and Germany, had been agreed to by the Protestants themselves as a favorable place for holding the assembly;[1] but when the plague made it uninhabitable, Charles V. protested against the translation of the Council to Bologna.

Paul III. had not forseen this opposition. He dies; and three other Sovereign Pontiffs, like him, are called away by death before the completion of this great work; each new Pontificate necessarily bringing with it fresh delays and difficulties.

The council, interrupted by the plague, by war, and by the deaths of those who had to preside over it, was prolonged over eighteen years, and during five different pontificates: those of Paul III, who opened it, of Julius III. and of Pius IV. who witnessed its termination. The reigns of Marcellus II. and of Paul IV., both occurred during the interruptions caused by civil war.

At least no one can doubt that such an assembly was free. Conceive a moral restraint submitted to during the space of eighteen years, under five pontificates, by three hundred bishops, without a protest being ever raised against it by a single individual! The true history of the council, the correspondence of the Fathers, the very decrees which they drew up prove that their liberty was complete, and that the danger was rather that of an abuse

[1] Prompsault, n. 722.

than of a want of it. The bishops, in giving their suffrages, conformed to rules which they had themselves established; and if the question was one of dogma, the resolutions were not taken unless the voices were almost unanimous. The legates had imposed on themselves the law of not giving their opinions in the particular congregations, where their votes might have influenced others. Instead of exercising the least violence, they had themselves, especially under Paul III., to submit to much rudeness. The discourse of the Carmelite, Marinier, against tradition,[1] and that of Bartholomew *de Martyribus* for the reformation of the Cardinals, prove that the liberty of speech sometimes degenerated into license. In a general Congregation, which followed the thirteenth session, the Fathers complained that several had abused the liberty allowed them, and themselves made rules to restrain it. At every page of the history of Soave, as well as of mine, says Cardinal Pallavicini,[2] you see bold oppositions arise which often impede the designs and wishes of the legates, and frequently by means of debate and personal efforts, triumph to the detriment of the Court of Rome. They so often departed from its opinions, that the cardinals, who were better informed on that point than any one else, pressed this consideration on Pius IV. as a ground for modifying the decrees when he confirmed the council. The Sovereign Pontiff could therefore say with truth in the Bull of Confirmation:[3] "We have favored the liberty of the Council to such an extent that we have of our own accord even left to it, the free determination of subjects properly reserved to the Apostolic See."

Meanwhile twenty-five sessions had been held. In the last, at which more than three hundred bishops were present—among whom were nine Cardinals, three Patriarchs, viz., of Jerusalem, Aquileia and Venice, and thirty-

[1] Prompsault, n. 539. [2] Ibid, 1090.

[3] Nobis adeo concilii libertati faventibus, ut etiam de rebus Sedi Apostolicæ proprie reservatis liberum ipsi arbitrium . . . ultro permiserimus. See Pallavicini, book xxiv. c. 14; and book viii.

three Archbishops, without reckoning sixteen abbots or generals of orders, and one hundred and forty-eight theologians of all orders and all countries—all the decrees published from the commencement were read over, and were again approved and subscribed by all the Fathers. Accordingly Pius IV., in a Consistory held the 26th of January, 1564, approved and confirmed the Council in a book which was signed by all the Cardinals. He drew up, the same year, a profession of faith conformable in all respects with the definitions of the Council, in which it is declared, that its authority is accepted; and since that time not only all the bishops of the Catholic world, but all the priests that are called to teach the way of salvation even to children, nay, all heretics, on abjuring their errors and returning to the bosom of the Church, have sworn that they had no other faith than that of this holy assembly. The States of Portugal, Venice, Spain, Sicily, Flanders, the greater part of the German States, Poland, &c., &c., accepted the Council in a solemn manner. In France, the civil power refused to register it for fear of irritating the Protestants; but the clergy solemnly accepted it in 1615.

"It is certain," says Bossuet,[1] "that it is in such sense received and approved in all the churches that are united in communion with Rome, that they no more reject its authority than they do that of the Council of Nice. And the proof of this acceptance exists in all the works of the Catholic doctors, among whom there will not be found a single *one* who replies to an objection derived from the Council of Trent, by saying that the Council is not received, which they do not hesitate to say of certain articles on discipline which are not received everywhere. . . . . Yes, I call on you to show me one Catholic writer, one bishop, one priest, one man, be he who he may, who believes that he can say in the Catholic Church: I do not receive the faith of Trent—we may doubt about the faith

[1] Letter to Leibnitz, dated in 1693.

of Trent.—Never will this be found. We are agreed on this point, therefore, as much in Germany and France, as in Italy or even at Rome, and everywhere else; which implies the incontestible acceptance of the Council in all that regards faith. Any other acceptance which you might demand is unnecessary; for if there must be an assembly to accept a council, you might with no less reason call for another assembly to accept that; and so from formality to formality, from acceptance to acceptance we should go on without end. And the term at which we must stop is to hold as infallible what the Church, which is infallible, receives unanimously, without there being on that point any dispute throughout the whole body.

"We see thus that it is of little importance whether there have been protests against this council once, twice, as many times as you will; for besides the fact that these protests never concerned the faith, it is enough that they continue without effect, through the subsequent consent, which depends on no formality, but on the sole promise of Jesus Christ, and the mere notoriety of universal consent.

"It is thought objectionable to pass and to accept so many anathemas all at once. It would not be thought so, if it was considered that these anathemas of which so great a number were pronounced at Trent, depend, after all, on five or six points, from which all the rest so clearly and naturally flow, that it is plain they could not be disputed without at the same time disputing also the principle from which they are derived. Thus to secure faith in the principles, it was no less necessary to secure faith in the consequences, and to facilitate belief in them by express and particular decisions. . . . . .

"It is of no use to say that Protestants have not consented to the Council of Trent; for if bishops, though legitimately ordained, renounce the faith of their consecrations, and of the body of the Episcopate to which they

have been admitted, as the English, the Danes, and the Swedes unquestionably have done, they are thenceforward considered as no longer part of the body, and no regard is paid to their opinion. On still stronger grounds, no attention is due to those pastors who have been ordained independently of the Apostolic succession.

"After all, it is no longer a question of deliberating whether we shall receive the Council or not. It is certain that it is received in all that relates to faith. A profession of faith has been extracted from the words of the council; the Pope has propounded it; all the bishops have subscribed it, and are subscribing it every day; they see that the whole order of priests also subscribe it. Here there is neither surprise nor violence; all glory in giving in their adherance thereto. In this submission is included their submission to the Council of Trent. The Council of Trent, therefore, is subscribed by the whole body of the Episcopate of the entire Catholic Church. To MAKE US DELIBERATE AFTER THIS WHETHER WE WILL RECEIVE THIS COUNCIL, IS TO MAKE US DELIBERATE WHETHER WE WILL BELIEVE THE CHURCH INFALLIBLE, WHETHER WE WILL BE CATHOLICS, WHETHER WE WILL BE CHRISTIANS.

The true and real history of the Council of Trent was nobly vindicated from the calumnies of Father Paul by Father Pallavicini, afterwards Cardinal; and has lately been written with as much truth as taste by the learned writer who has been called on to continue the History of the Gallican Church.[1]

III.

Authority of the Council of Trent—This Council is the legitimate representation of the whole Church.

Protestants admit the first general councils; they ought on the same grounds to admit the Council of Trent. In no council have the deliberations been less hurried or

[1] Histoire du Councile de Trente; par le P. Prat S. J. chez Perisse, 1851. 2 vols, 8°.

more matured; none has received the adhesion of a greater number of bishops; for it has been subscribed by all the bishops that have been consecrated from 1564 to the present day; none has been the object of more attacks, while all the objections, that have been alleged against it, have proved futile. Suppose there were few Eastern bishops at Trent, is that a reason for invalidating its authority? There were few Western bishops at the Council of Nice; there was not one at the Council of Constantinople; at those of Ephesus and Chalcedon there were only the legates of the Pope; and, notwithstanding this, their decrees being accepted by the West as well as by the East, have become the light and law of the world. The faith of the East was not troubled when the Church assembled at Trent; there was therefore no pressing reason for its taking part in the council; and at a later period it testified its entire adhesion.

On the 28th of November, 1518, by an act executed before a public notary Luther had appealed from the Pope to a General Council lawfully assembled, representing the universal Church;[1] and in the diet of Augsburg in 1530, the Lutherans in their confession of faith had declared that they were ready to submit to a General Council.[2] Well, then: here is a General Council, such as a General Council had been defined by all theologians, anterior to the Council of Trent. Does not St. Thomas say that the Pope alone has the right of convoking a General Council; that the decision of matters of religion could not be devolved on private persons? Have not all General Councils been assemblies of Bishops, presided over by the Pope, judging not only according to the Scriptures but also according to tradition, and condemning dangerous errors without entering the lists with those who maintained them? Is it not a mockery to appeal to a General Council, and then, when it assembles for the purpose of deciding on this appeal,

[1] Leplat *Monumenta Conc. Trid.* t. ii. p. 37.

[2] Bossuet, *Hist. des Variations*, liv. iii. n. 62.

to impose conditions upon it which have never been known in any previous Council? We will not obey, say some, if the Pope has anything to do with the Council; we wish, say others, that every one should be admitted with a definitive voice; and—that Jesus Christ alone should preside .... and—that Scripture alone should be the judge; in short, we will not obey the Council unless the Council obeys us, &c.

The Church of Jesus Christ at all times and in all places manifests itself by its characteristics of unity, sanctity, etc., which we have already described. The Church, which for three hundred years has subscribed the definitions of Trent, is *one*, perfectly one, in professing one and the same faith, in participating in the same sacraments, in obeying the same head, who is Peter, living on in Paul III., in Julius III., in Paul IV. in Pius IV., as he still lives on at this day in Pius IX. Here we have a building; while apart from it are only ruins, which time reduces to dust; here is a fold; apart from it, sheep without a shepherd; this is a well-ordered city; elsewhere all is anarchy; here you see a living body; elsewhere only dislocated, paralyzed or lifeless limbs.

"You see on one side," says Florimond de Rémond, "a company in good order, with a well armed captain at their head; followed by his soldiers, the colors in the middle, the drums beating, and the rest following. On the other side you see a troop of children going along the streets with wooden swords by their side and scarfs on their shoulders, drumming on a kettle, each one ordering his companions. Such is the order of the true Church on on the one side, on the other the disorders of the false sects which would counterfeit it."

The Church, assembled at Trent, shows itself *holy* by the vigor which it displays in contending against errors and abuses. In one half of its chapters, the Council is employed on this great work of *reformation*. It proscribes duels; it reduces the Liturgies to unity; it banishes pro-

fane airs and secular music from the holy temples; it institutes Seminaries for the education of the clergy; for the instruction of the people it establishes at cathedrals, free schools and lectures on holy Scripture. In concert with the Sovereign Pontiff, it diminishes the number of exemptions from ordinary jurisdiction; it reminds Pastors that they are bound to continence, to residence, to frequent and diligent preaching; it interdicts all appearance of simony and venality in the distribution of ecclesiastical offices, in preaching indulgences, and in dispensing the sacraments; it abolishes the office of questors, &c. The most captious could not conceive anything better than these admirable regulations.

Thus the tree was pruned, not uprooted; the heavenly physicians cured without killing their patient. In order to reform the priest and the monk, they did not destroy the priesthood and the religious state; to suppress incontinence, they did not preach universal marriage; they plucked up the weeds in the field of their Lord, while they preserved the good seed.

And meanwhile what was passing outside this venerable assembly in which so many lights and virtues were brought together:

St. Charles Borromeo, the great promoter of the Council of Trent, was causing its decrees to be executed throughout his Province, and was exciting the admiration of the world by the innocence of his life, the fervor of his zeal, the wisdom of his administration, and the austerity of his penitence.*

St. Ignatius Loyola, Laynez, St. Francis Borgia, were founding at Rome a company of apostolic men destined to correct the errors of the age by their learning, and to put vice to confusion by their virtues.

St. Philip Neri established the Congregation of Priests

*The American reader will not need to be reminded that this great Saint originated the Sunday-school system of instruction—the credit of which is often claimed for the Reformation as one of its most admirable features.—(Ed. Am. Ed.)

of the Oratory, of which Baronius was one of the most brilliant lights, and made himself so dear to the Roman people, that soon after his death they chose him for their patron, after St. Peter and St. Paul.

A second Paul, St. Francis Xavier, was bearing the name of Jesus to India and Japan, and St. Louis Bertrand was making it known in America.

St. Francis de Sales was training himself to become soon the doctor and charming model of pious souls.

St. Vincent de Paul was preparing to become the consolation of all the sorrows which he himself had first so bitterly experienced. At a future day the Priests of the Mission, the Sisters of Charity, millions of children abandoned even by their mothers, will call him father.

St. Theresa, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. John of the Cross were reforming monasteries, and carrying to the highest perfection the virtues of the contemplative life.

St. Magdalene de Pazzi, St. Catharine de Ricci, St. Frances de Chantal were showing themselves the rivals of St. Theresa in action, in contemplation and pious foundations.

Canisius, Bellarmine, Baronius, Suarez were continuing the line of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

St. Joseph de Calasanctius and the venerable abbot of La Salle were making themselves the apostles of the young, of whom St. Aloysius de Gonzaga, St. Stanislaus de Kostka and the Blessed John Berchmans were soon to appear as the perfect models.

The Church, presided over by Pontiffs like St. Pius V., was about to give birth to an age more justly celebrated than those of Augustus and Leo the Tenth—the age of Louis the Great. Thus did she show herself more fruitful than ever: while outside her pale what a sad spectacle presents itself to view? Desolated monasteries, ruined churches, violated vows, the Holy Sacrifice abolished, the sacraments deserted, good works proclaimed to be useless, the freedom of the human will declared to be an empty

name, divorce breaking up the family, civil war deluging States with blood, tyranny and arbitrary power trampling on religious society, anarchy invading Christian Europe!

The Church is to be *Catholic* in her duration and in her empire. Such the Church, represented by the Council of Trent, shows herself to be. She is Catholic in her duration, for her first act is to repeat the Creed of Nice, declaring thereby that the faith defined by the first general council is her faith. Whenever there is a question to be resolved, she inquires what does tradition answer, she calls for the testimonies of the first Fathers of the Church, whose very expressions she frequently employs. The enemy of all innovation she follows her ancient maxim—"That is true which has been in all times and in all places since the age of the Apostles:" *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab Apostolis.*

She is universal in her empire. For the decrees of the Council are subscribed at Trent itself by the Roman Pontiff, the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Aquileia and Venice, by three hundred bishops, among whom are Italians, French, Germans, Spaniards, Portuguese, Poles, Hungarians, English, Irish, Flemish, Croates, Moravians, Illyrians, &c.; and absent from Trent by all the bishops who during three centuries have been spread over the five portions of the globe. Some English bishops, who were simply schismatical under Henry VIII., but afterwards under Elizabeth really heretical, and with Calvin denied the Sacrament of Holy Orders, without which there is neither Episcopate nor Priesthood; and some Danish and Swedish bishops, who preserved the errors of Luther and with them the Episcopate which Luther so violently attacked, are the sole exceptions. Elsewhere episcopal thrones are broken down, and laymen, without title, without mission, without religious consecration, draw up confessions of faith, found sects, and organize confusion. While Europe thus sees some of the provinces of the

Church withdraw from her authority, St. Francis Xavier, St. Louis Bertrand, Oviedo and Nunez, Patriarchs of Ethiopia, Bartholomew las Casas, the Blessed Claver,[1] Apostle of the Negroes, go, in the wake of Vasco de Gama, of Fernando Cortez, of Pizarro, to gain a new world to Jesus Christ, and to compensate the Church for her recent losses. Thus the Church is Catholic, and Catholic without a rival, at the time of the Reformation as at this day, as yesterday, as always. And outside her pale what do you see then, and now and always? Division dividing itself, and subdivision subdividing, and so on without limit, till there are as many churches as there are individuals, as many creeds as men.

The Church at Trent shows herself to be *Apostolic.* The Roman Pontiffs who successively preside over the Council can name the two hundred Popes, who, without a break handed down the authority of St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, even to themselves. They can tell us the day and the hour of their election and consecration, which are consigned to imperishable monuments. Their authority then is Apostolic. The three hundred bishops who sit at the Council, the four hundred bishops, who, not being able to be present, accept its decrees, the thirty thousand bishops, who, during three centuries have subscribed its decisions, can also show us the authentic titles which prove the transmission of the Apostolic authority from the Pontiff who founded their church down to themselves, and the validity of their ordination and the legitimate character of their mission. Here, then, nothing is arbitrary, nothing uncertain. We breath freely in the society of Apostles, we hear their word, we obey their authority. Outside this Church what do you find? Some bishops, deprived of all communion with other bishops, and with the See of Rome, who soon fall from schism into heresy, and no longer confer more than an ordination, at the least of doubtful validity, on a few successors. There

[1] Beatified Sept. 21, 1851.

and elsewhere preachers without mission, pastors without title, ministers . . . of the State, it may be . . . but of Jesus Christ and of His Church? that they cannot prove.

But, you say, the definitions of the council cannot be maintained, they are contrary to Scripture, absurd. All Protestants are not of that opinion. Fessler said;[1] "The work of the venerable Fathers assembled at Trent is the consecration of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, drawn from the Holy Scripture and Apostolic Tradition." This objection, however, we shall examine presently. Meanwhile let us finish this part of our subject by the following dilemma: Either the Church of Jesus Christ, which on the strength of our Saviour's promise you believe to be imperishable, infallible, one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, is in the Communion of the Fathers of Trent, or it is with the Protestants. With the Protestants? . . But with what Protestants? For Henry VIII. is not a Protestant yet; his belief is entirely Catholic, and he excommunicates Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin. Luther, on his part, gives Henry VIII, as severe a scourging, as if he were scourging Antichrist or the Pope. Calvin burns Servetus, a premature Socinian, and will hold no communion with Luther. Luther delivers over the Sacramentaries to Satan; and the Anabaptists on their side turn all to blood and fire. A thousand sects spring up, which are agreed on nothing but negations and destruction, and the history of innumberable variations commences, to end only with schism. In the midst of this incurable anarchy all vestige of unity, of sanctity, and of Catholic and Apostolic authority disappears; those most sacred doctrines of the adorable Trinity, of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, of the inspiration of the sacred books, are rudely submitted to reformation; sacraments the most necessary to salvation, Baptism and the Eucharist, are abandoned; all the links which united the present to the past are broken; and it may be said without blasphemy, that if Jesus

[1] Cited by Hænighaus, in "*La Réforme contre la Réforme.*"

Christ came down from Heaven for no other object than to produce this chaos, He had better have remained in Heaven. The simple view of Protestantism, if we believe that we see in it the work of Christ, carries us on almost by force to the denial of His divinity.

IV.

A brief view of Protestant Councils, compared with the Council of Trent.—Synod of Dort in 1618. *Synod of Lausanne in* 1838. *Synod of Paris in* 1848, *&c.*

And yet Protestanism has tried all means to preserve itself from anarchy. It has imposed creeds, it has held Councils. Here are some specimens of them. A writer, who cannot be suspected, sketches the features of the Synod of Dort in the following words:[1] "It was opened in November, 1618, and held a hundred and fifty-four sessions up to the 9th of May, 1619. There were ninety-seven deputies, from the States of Holland, from England, Switzerland and Germany. . . . The officers were all chosen from among the partisans of *Gomar*. They made the *Arminians* or *Remonstrants* appear as accused parties, not as theologians called on to explain their doctrines. The Remonstrants complained that they were being judged by their adversaries, and alleged in objection the very same grounds on which the Protestants had repudiated the Councils. 'We wish,' they said, 'for a Council in which we should be on an equal footing with the rest, a Council which has not taken a side, which does not treat us as heretics; otherwise we should be judged by our adversaries.' In the inaugural address, the orator Lydius expressed his joy at the opening of this Synod, in which with the help of God, they were going to search out, examine and settle the points then controverted on matters of religion. The Calvinists of the Council insisted strongly on the necessity of having religious con-

[1] M. Chenevière, *Essais théologiques*, t. ii. p. 432.

troversies decided by authority; the decisions were taken by a majority of votes, notwithstanding very marked differences. The Arminians were banished, crushed and imprisoned; and *Barneveldt* was put to death, because he was favorable to the condemned doctrine, and had, they said, disturbed religion and grieved the church of God."

Other times, other ideas. Our Protestant Synods of modern days are not more consistent, but they appear less sanguinary; let us cite two almost contemporaneous examples.

In the month of March, 1838, a Protestant Synod was assembled at Lausanne. Thirty-two pastors, called together by a Council of State, the members of which might be Catholics, Jews or Atheists, assembled daily in the Hall of the Great Council, which was to be the judge on final appeal. They first enquired what the Church was, whether it was a school or a society, or both a *school* and *society* at once, or a *society* and a *school* in turn; that is to say, at the very outset, the existence of a teaching ministry in the church was made a matter of question. Nothing was decided. Nevertheless they proceeded to discuss this grave question: *Is Baptism necessary for being a member of the Church?* On this a member observed that "in order to continue in good harmony with those who do not baptize their children, a practice *which, in some years might become general among us*, it was more prudent not to require this condition." Baptism being provisionally maintained, they occupied themselves with the confession of faith. And first, ought there to be one at all? The majority said *yes*. Ought it to be declared variable or invariable? *Essentially variable*, was the answer of twenty-one voices out of thirty-two! . . . And ought the ancient Helvetic Confession to be changed? Fifteen voices said *yes*, fifteen said *no*. . . It was finally resolved that the Helvetic Confession should be preserved *not as a rule of faith, but as a rule of teaching;* a distinction which some thought subtle. Next, men who called themselves

ministers of the Church and pastors of souls, enquired in the nineteenth century of the Christian era: To whom does the government of the church belong? to us or to the laity? Excellent things were said on this subject; among others, the very just observation was made that for three hundred years it was the State and the State alone that governed the Protestant churches. Struck by this truth, a candid minister thereupon said, "I demand that we propose to the Council of State that the Church should at length be something." . . On this question: Are the laity competent to be judges of doctrine? sixteen said yes, sixteen said no; and as a definitive settlement the controversy was submitted to the decision of the Great Council! On this subject some said that they had a mission; that they believed in their ordination; others that they had no authority but what resulted from the weight of their reasonings; that their consecration conferred no special character upon them. In fact they did not know what the Church was, what they were themselves, what they had to teach on points the most essential—Baptism, for instance; they were only sure of one thing, that is, that with them the State ruled and governed the Church, ... if, that is to say, there was a Church!

In France on a larger theatre the same poor and miserable exhibition was made.

On the 9th of September, 1848, there was assembled at Paris a Council or Synod charged to represent the French Protestant church or churches, and give them a new organization. Who had convoked it? Ninety persons who derived all their mission, all their authority for doing this from the common thought, that the meeting would be useful. The object of the synod, according to the idea of those who assembled it, was to *treat on all the great questions of principles.* The qualifications required of those who were to take part in it must, it seems, have been severe, for it is not easy for all men to *treat on al*

the great questions of principles. Nevertheless the ninety zealous promoters proved facile enough in determining these qualifications, doubtless that they might be pardoned for the overboldness of their initiative. The following are the questions which were proposed and the answers which gained the majority: Shall it be required that an Elector should prove that he has been baptized? No. That he should have made his first communion? No. That he habitually partake of the Lord's Supper? No. That he habitually attend public worship? No. That he declare, like St. Peter, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God? No. What then shall be required in order to be an Elector of the members of the Synod of Reformed France? To be twenty-one years of age, to have resided a year in the church where he votes, to enjoy his civil rights, and to declare that he belongs to the Reformed Church of France, and heartily adheres to it. The elections, made on these bases, brought to the assembly ninety deputies, of whom fifty-two were pastors, and thirty-eight laymen; some among them were rationalists of all shades, the others partisans of this or that faith, while the majority were functionaries paid by the State. The first question mooted by the Synod, which had been called together, as we have said, *to treat on all the great questions of principles*, was this: Should a new confession of faith be substituted in place of the ancient confessions, which we unanimously declare to be superannuated? The debates raised by this question proved that it was insoluble. "In the eyes of far the greater number," says the critical History of the Synod, written by two Protestants,[1] "the excellence of a reformed church consists in being absolutely independent of everything that resembles a positive faith, whatever it be. Its primary character is to favor an infinite variety of doctrines; it ought to edify the world by the spectacle of the peace-

[1] Le synode réformé de 1848, par deux témoins (M. M. de Pressensé and Léon Pilatte).

able diversities of contradictory opinions, brought close together, without any shock or struggle arising. The Reformation promulgated no other doctrine than the abolition of doctrine, and a church which possesses any one dogma whatsoever is tainted with Catholicism. Thus it is not merely a confession of faith, but the faith itself which is interdicted to the Protestant church." Such is a Reformed Church in the judgment of the liberal side of the Synod.

This opinion prevailed. It was therefore resolved, in order to satisfy this sceptical majority, that all dogmatic questions should be set aside for the present. Then in order to afford a little consolation to the advocates of Confessions of Faith, the assembly decided that it reserved these questions till a future time, and, finally, for fear the rationalists should be offended with this reserve, it was determined (art. 51 of the project of law) that the general synod would hereafter only have to occupy itself with regulations concerning *worship*, *discipline*, *and ecclesiastical administration*. In consequence, the synod which was assembled to *treat on all the great questions of principles* and to provide for the most pressing interests of French Protestantism, eighty-five years after the last assembly under this name had been held, found nothing, absolutely nothing to say concerning the faith, except that these questions would be treated afterwards by other synods, which would not have the right to occupy themselves with them. Behold how one *great principle* only, that of the competence of the Council in the matter of doctrine, was treated by the reformed Synod of 1848! However, in spite of all their efforts for keeping off discussions on doctrine, one question bearing on orthodoxy forced itself on them when they came to inquire what qualifications should be required in the persons called by election to become members of the general Consistories, which are invested with the highest authority in the project of law. They can refuse their approbation to the nominations of

pastors made by the particular consistories, refuse to install them, and in certain cases suspend them provisionally. It was asked, in what cases will they be able to oppose their veto, to refuse installation, to suspend on account of doctrine? For, to come to the question, if a man should preach such or such a revolting doctrine, could nothing be done against him? The difficulty was serious. The consistory in that case would be either judge of doctrine, or powerless to repress certain enormities. If it was made judge, where would the law be? If not, what would become of good order? It was proposed to determine the cases in which it might act; but this would be to postpone the difficulty. The rationalists would have wished to strike a blow at the *fanatics*, as they call them; the *Christians* would no less have wished to reach the declared unbelievers. The menacing spectre of doctrine then again arose before them; they drew back, they kept silence, and without having said a single word which could in any case authorize the consistory to exercise a surveillance over the teaching of the pastors, they concluded the third title, concerning its powers, with this inevitable article, "the general consistory will administer its property and accept the donations and legacies which are made to it whatever be their destination."

The general consistories are elected by the sectional consistories, and these again by universal suffrage; but what are the qualifications required for taking part in this election?

Since all power over the teaching and the government of the church emanates from the elector, this person, one would think, ought to offer no trifling guarantees of his morality and orthodoxy. All that the law indisputably requires is, twenty-one years of age, a year's residence in the church, and the first communion. M. Grandpierre wished that they should add, the profession of the Gospel not belied by the conduct; there is a cry at its inquisitorial character, and his amendment is rejected by

a large majority. M. Monad and Bastic demand *a certificate of good life and morals*, to keep away from the election *men notoriously scandalous and infamous.* They cannot obtain it. Another proposes that the elector should declare that, he *believes in the truths of the Bible.* M. Rouville opposes this amendment, as implying the adoption of a Catholic principle! M. C. Coquerel declares that as these words; *the truths of the Bible*, do not have the same sense for all persons, it would be a farce to call on the electors to subscribe them; he sees no other means of escaping from this scandalous position than that "of establishing the liberty of the understanding before God." M. Monad asks as a favor "a religious qualification of some kind, be it ever so small." "It would keep away from the electoral urn," says M. de Clausonne, "many persons who without being able to fulfil it, *make many donations to the Church.*" In short, to conciliate the rationalists who do not wish to keep away any unbeliever from voting, and the orthodox who wish to admit none but believers, they invent the following mode of proceeding. The law shall say: "Those only are electors who acknowledge the Bible as the word of God and the sole rule of their faith;" but no one will have to make this declaration, individually, and the law being read from the pulpit, each person being left to his own conscience will be free to go and vote.

And this is all that is required of the elector. In regard to the persons qualified to be elected, they are not much more exacting: to bring up his children in the Protestant church and to be thirty years of age in order to be an *Elder*, to present a diploma of bachelor of divinity in order to be a *Pastor*,—that is all. "What pastors are these," cries M. de Pressensé "from whom they do not require either faith or piety, nor even a certificate of capacity and good conduct! For be you what you will, Rationalist, Voltairian or Hegelian; preach the Gospel or philosophy, doctrine or morality, or that vague sentimentalism,

which is neither the one or the other, it matters not; you can in any case be a pastor of the Reformed Church."

We have remarked that a majority of the synod were salaried by the State. Now, these were anxious to preserve their position, which the most zealous Protestants, M. Scherer amongst others, had in vain denounced as fatal to the Reformed Church. To preserve the salaries the synod sacrificed all, even its own work, which it mutilated beforehand in order more easily to obtain the sanction of the Constituent Assembly, and which it considered would be a failure if it did not secure that sanction. Thus the question of the budget overshadowed all others, reconciled all incompatibilities, and in despite of all opposition established the Protestant tribune on the public purse. Hence the witticism of M. de Gasparin in full synod: "Let the State be bankrupt and the same day our *entente cordiale* (that is our Church) will stop payment."

Thus convoked by no one knows whom, elected by any one who could believe that he adhered to the Reformed Church of France, the Protestant Council of 1848 spoke of doctrine and morals only to proclaim with the same breath its competency and incompentency. It regulated the internal organization of its church only with the view of submitting its plans to a legislative assembly almost wholly Catholic,—Catholic, yes . . . . but which voted the budget!

Such is the official balance sheet of Protestantism; *Doctrine* and *morals*, on the point which involves all the rest, yes and no at once.—*Organization* and *government;* a project no matter what, submitted to the State. Sum total, a large figure in the budget of Public Worship.

Thus was *a great question of principle* resolved by the Synod itself in a manner sufficiently intelligible.

Et nunc . . . . . intelligite.

V.

First, Second, and Third Sessions of the Council of Trent.

Let us return to Trent, and enter that great basilica in which the gravest interests of humanity are seriously debated.

FIRST SESSION OF THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT.

HELD UNDER PAUL III., DECEMBER 13, 1545.

A Secretary ascends the pulpit and reads:

Decree touching the opening of the Council.

Doth it please you,—unto the praise and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost,—for the increase and exaltation of the Christian faith and religion; for the extirpation of heresies; for the peace and union of the Church; for the reformation of the Clergy and Christian people; for the depression and extinction of the enemies of the Christian name,—to decree and declare that the sacred and general Council of Trent do begin, and hath begun?

They answered: It pleaseth us.

SECOND SESSION.

HELD JANUARY 7, 1546.

In this session the Fathers made a decree on the manner in which they should conduct themselves during the holding of the Council. The substance of it is as follows:

The decree first recommends to the faithful who are assembled at Trent the fear and avoidance of sin; prayer, confession, the fulfilment of the Commandments of God and of the Church; and specially to the priests and bishops assiduity in prayer, frequent celebration of the holy mysteries, fasting on all Fridays, and almsgiving. Every Thursday a Mass of the Holy Ghost was to be celebrated in the cathedral. The bishops were to take care to have reading during their meals. They were to watch over the conduct of their servants; to study the questions pending before the Council; to express their sentiments with modesty, &c.

THIRD SESSION.

HELD FEBRUARY 4, 1546.

DECREE TOUCHING THE SYMBOL OF FAITH.

In the Name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.

This sacred and holy, œcumenical, and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein, considering the magnitude of the matters to be treated of, especially of those

comprised under the two heads, of the extirpating of heresies, and the reforming of manners, for the sake of which chiefly It is assembled, and recognizing with Saint Paul, that Its *wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the spirit of wickedness in the high places*,[1] exhorts, with the same Apostle, all and each, above all things, to be *strengthened in the Lord, and in the might of His power, in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith they may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one, and to take the helmet of salvation, with the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God.*[2] Wherefore, that this Its pious solicitude may begin and proceed by the grace of God, It ordains and decrees that, before all other things, a confession of faith is to be set forth; following herein the examples of the Fathers, who have been wont, in the most sacred councils,[3] at the beginning of the Actions thereof, to oppose this shield against heresies; and with this alone, at times, have they drawn the unbelieving to the faith, overthrown heretics, and confirmed the faithful. For which cause, this council has thought good, that the Symbol of faith which the holy Roman Church makes use of,—as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that firm and sole foundation *against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*,[4] be expressed in the very same words in which it is read in all the churches. Which Symbol is as follows: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in one sole Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, true God of true God; begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; and was made man: crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, he suffered and was buried; and he rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures; and He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and again He will come with glory, to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end; and in the Holy Ghost the Lord, and the giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and Son together is adored and glorified; who spoke by the prophets; and one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

NOTE.—We will return to this profession of Faith when we treat of the Trinity and of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

[1] Ephes. vi. 12. [2] Ib. v. 10, 16, 17.
[3] Concil. Nicœn. Rom 1 sub. Jul. I; Concil Hippon. in princ. Concil. Constant. vi. Act. 17. [4] Matth. xvi. 18.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

On the Holy Scripture.

Fourth Session of the Council.

I.

Of the Church and Scripture.

The books comprehended under the general title of the *Bible* or the *Old* and *New Testaments*, are called Holy Scripture, and also the Word of God, because they are regarded by the Church, not merely as authentic and truthful, but also as inspired, or written by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost. St. Paul recommends this "Scripture inspired of God" to Timothy,[1] and St. Peter speaks of those "holy men of God" who "spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost."[2] The Fathers called these books *holy* and *divine*, and frequently say, that God Himself is *their author*.

The catalogue of these books is called the *Canon* of the Scriptures, and hence the name *canonical* given to the writings themselves. Those which were inserted in the Canon immediately after their publication are called Proto-Canonical; those which found a place in it later are called Deutero-Canonical.[3]

At the time the Fathers of Trent assembled, there was a bitter and obstinate war declared against the authority, the institutions, the sacraments, the dogmas, the moral

[1] Divinitus inspirata, II. *Tim.* iii. 16.

[2] Spiritu Sancto inspirante locuti sunt sancti Dei homines. II. *Petr.* i. 21.

[3] The Protestants choose to call them *Apocryphal*, notwithstanding their being received as inspired by the synagogue and the primitive Church.

teaching, the discipline of the Church, in the name of Scripture. The innovators found in our sacred books that the Pope was Antichrist, and the Church of Rome the harlot of Babylon, and her traditions "old wives' fables," and the priesthood the common property of all Christians, and faith alone sufficient for salvation, &c., &c. Accordingly, deserting the Altar, they crowded round the preacher or the pulpit where "the pure gospel" was explained to them; and the Church, a desolate mother forsaken by so many of her children, seemed to be repudiated even by the Divine Word who had chosen her for His Spouse.

We shall presently relate how she was avenged for this contempt. They turned the Scriptures against her, but the Scriptures altered, mutilated, interpreted in a sense utterly foreign to the unanimous sentiments of the Fathers and Doctors. She replied that she received the Scriptures and venerated them, with all piety and reverence; and that in consequence she provided for their being acknowledged as the work of God Himself, and faithfully interpreted and profitably employed.

In order to make the meaning and the bearing of her decisions more easily and clearly understood, we shall proceed to explain the mutual relations in which the Church and Scripture, and heresy, which is opposed to both, stand to one another.

II.

Relations of the Church and Scripture.

First of all let us make it clear that in point of time the Church precedes the Scriptures; that is to say, she was in existence, constituted and perfect, possessing entire authority, before there was even any question of the Scriptures. This is an historical or chronological point of great importance, on which it is impossible for any one to raise a doubt.

In the ancient law we see the Jewish Church con-

stituted and governed, Moses invested with authority, the people going to him to seek the judgment or sentence of God *quærens sententiam Dei*,[1] Aaron clothed with the priesthood, Joshua placed at the head of their armies, the synagogue directed by chiefs, who are called in Exodus, *Principes populi* or *Synagogæ*,—and as yet the Scriptures had no existence. The first tables of the law, graven by the hand of the Lord, had been broken by Moses, the second were not brought down from Sinai and presented to the people until some months afterwards.[2] It was very much later, according as events succeeded each other, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. As for the other books, written by the Judges, David, Solomon and the Prophets, they had no existence till many centuries after the institution and complete development of the ancient Church. It was not till a few years before the coming of our Saviour that the canon of the books of the Old Testament was closed by the second book of Maccabees.

Our Divine Master appears . . . He preaches, He commands His disciples to preach throughout the whole world, but He does not write anything, nor does He command any one else to write. He imparts His own authority to the Apostles and Peter, their head; after His ascension He sends down His spirit upon them, and from that moment the Christian Church is constituted, and animated with a living soul; the model Church which that Spirit Himself describes, as one heart and one soul in a multitude of believers. She assembles in Council, whether to appoint a successor to Judas, or to declare the Jewish ceremonies abrogated; she pronounces on the questions respecting Gentiles, she preaches, she baptizes; she converts the world; and as yet the New Testament is not written. Among the whole number of the Apostles and disciples there are only seven who have written anything at all, and they have written only fragments of history and some letters. First of all St. Matthew, at the

[1] Exod. xviii. 15. [2] Exod. xxxii. 19; xxxiv. 28.

very earliest six years after the ascension of Jesus Christ, begins his Gospel. St. John does not publish his, with his Letters and the Apocalypse, till towards the close of the first century, that is to say, forty years after St. Paul had said to the Romans, "Your faith is spoken of in the whole world."[1] At the time when St. Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, there were numberless churches in existence governed each by its own Pastor, as we see in the book of the Acts itself. Need we say that the church of Rome existed before the Epistle to the Romans? the churches of Corinth, Colosse, Thessalonica, Galatia, before the Epistles to the Corinthians, Colossians, Thessalonians and Galatians? The Apocalypse contains exhortations and reproofs addressed to the *Angels*, that is, the Bishops of the churches.

But it does not follow that because a Gospel or Apostolic Epistle was written and known in some particular church, it was therefore diffused through the universal Church. Even as respects the whole New Testament we learn from St. Irenæus, that at the end of the second century there were still many churches, which believed all the doctrines of the Apostles, without the word of God having ever been communicated to them in a written form. "If the Apostles," he says, "had not left us any writings, would it not have been our duty to be guided by the rule of that tradition which they delivered to those to whom they entrusted the churches? A rule asserted by many of the barbarous nations believing in Christ, who, not possessing any written language, have the words of salvation written without paper and ink, in the hearts by the Spirit, and carefully preserve the ancient doctrines delivered to them."[2]

Let us observe further, with Cardinal Wiseman, that the Greek language, which was employed by the writers of the New Testament, though widely diffused at this epoch, was still not the popular language of the Roman

[1] Rom. i. 8. [2] Adv. Hæreses, lib. iii. c. 4.

Empire, any more than the Hebrew, in which the books of the Law were written, was the popular language of the Jews in the latter period of their history. But beyond those regions in which Greek was known, St. Thomas goes to preach the Gospel to the Indians, St. Bartholomew to the Parthians, St. Thaddeus in Mesopotamia, other Apostles in Spain: yet antiquity has not transmitted an Indian, or a Scythian translation, or an African text of the divine Scriptures. We only know of two ancient translations of the original text of the New Testament: the ancient Latin Vulgate, written towards the end of the first century or the beginning of the second; and a Syrian translation, of which the date is matter of dispute. But in Gaul, in Spain, in Germany, in the whole of the East, many centuries passed before the different churches possessed complete collections of the sacred books, and translations into the language of the people.

If there be then a fact, proved, verified and indisputable, it is this—that the Church existed before the Scripture: and we could prove with respect to each member of the Church what we have established as regards the entire Church herself. Does a man have faith in the Church of Jesus Christ, and accept her baptism? He is a Christian in any country in the world, whether he knows how to read or not, whether he is acquainted with the existence of the inspired books, or is ignorant of it. In the early days of the Church, the law of secrecy (Disciplina Arcani) required that the most sublime mysteries of Christianity, such as that of the Eucharist, and the books, which reveal these doctrines, should be well known to the initiated only, that is to say, to Christians thoroughly confirmed and proved in the faith. "Many solitaries," says St. Augustine, "lived in the deserts, having with them faith, hope and charity, but without the sacred books."

From these facts it follows, that a knowledge of the inspired writings is not necessary to salvation; that it is

not Scripture read and interpreted by each individual, which is the true rule of faith. Furthermore it follows, that the Church approves herself to men as a divine authority, independently of the Holy Scriptures.

She approves herself by those four NOTES, or distinctive characteristics, on which we have already dwelt. By her *unity*, for truth alone can unite in one and the same belief men of all places and of all times. By her *sanctity*, which reveals, what is good to the heart, whilst unity indicates the truth to the understanding. Every thing in the doctrine, the institutions, the practices, the ministry of the Church, in the examples and miracles of her heroes, tends to subdue, to conquer the passions, to captivate the senses, to establish man in the most perfect relations with God, his neighbor and himself. The *Catholicity* or universality of the Church presents to man the most imposing authority under heaven, especially when he sees united with universality those two attributes which naturally are incompatible with it, unity and sanctity. Lastly, the *Apostolicity* of the Church is a patent, manifest historical fact, of which the proofs are in the hands of every one of her ministers; a fact, which is no other than the divine institution of the Church by Him who said to His Apostles: "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." But we need not go over this demonstration again.

The Church existed before the Scripture. This we have proved. Let us add this second proposition, which is not less deserving of attention, and quite as certain: *It is that the Church alone, by means of her divine authenticity, supposed to be previously acknowledged, can establish the Canon of the Holy Books, and cause it to be adopted; and further determine the belief of mankind generally, in the authenticity and what is more the inspiration, of these books.*

What in fact is the important point of this process for which we declare that all human power is insufficient? It is not to verify the authenticity of a book by means of laborious researches, and then to communicate to a few

learned men the certainty thus acquired. Such an undertaking is accomplished every day by learning and science. Every day criticism is establishing that such and such works, in particular the books of the old and new Testaments, are authentic, are preserved in their integrity, and are uniformly truthful and reliable. According to the weight of the arguments alleged, this conclusion appears to follow more or less rigorously to the mind, and if the understanding is satisfied with the demonstration, it remains convinced that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, on grounds of the same kind, by which it is led to attribute the Iliad to Homer. This proof of the truth of our sacred books is of great service in preparing the way for the scientific proofs of the divine character of Christianity. Our plan, however, does not allow us to enter upon this subject. It may be seen in Bergier, in du Voisin, in Tholuck, who has suggested to Valroger his *Essay on the Credibility of the Gospels.*

But, I repeat, our point is not the certitude acquired by study and communicated by reasoning. The question we are considering is how we are to obtain from the whole christian world, the following *act of faith:* "I believe the inspiration of these seventy-two books, of which one recounts the history of creation, another describes the last days of the world, and the greater part tell us the mysterious thoughts of God; while all were composed at a period now very remote, and in languages entirely strange to us: I believe the inspiration of the Apocalypse, which contains, as St. Jerome says, as many mysteries as words; that of the second and third Epistles of St. John, in which there is no distinct evidence of inspired language; and that of the Canticle of Canticles, which so strongly resembles a secular love-song." And this act of faith is demanded without any previous demonstration, without allowing any possible hesitation, from the simple and the learned alike; it is required that it be firm, certain, incapable of being shaken, without the slightest doubt, and based upon

the grounds that God has Himself made His thought and His will known to us in this respect: for, as we have already said, an act of faith is the acquiescence of man in the infallible declaration of God.

In truth, whether we consider the nature of the fact to be admitted, I mean the inspiration of the seventy-two books written so many ages ago in Hebrew or Greek or Chaldee, or again the infinite number of persons to whom this verity is proposed as an object of faith, the immovable firmness of the certainty which is demanded from them, or the ground on which this undoubting assent is required—we must be convinced that it cannot be a question of literary criticism which is here submitted to their examination; but the necessary object of an act of faith, required from them by the authority of God Himself on the verity being proved by His Church. Accordingly since the promulgation of the Gospel, the proposition of the doctrine by the Church enters into the definition of faith: *The truth of faith*,—says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *makes us hold that for certain which the authority of the Church proves to have been revealed by God.*

In the first place, inspiration is a fact altogether supernatural, invisible, impalpable, beyond the reach of any of our senses; the work of God rather than of man, a fact which neither feeling nor reason will ever be able to discern with perfect certainty of evidence, and which cannot be established by human testimony, for no one has seen the Prophet or the Evangelist converse with God: no sacred writer has himself asserted the inspiration of each of his writings. I can believe this fact on the testimony of Jesus Christ or His Apostles; but left to my own researches only, I could never discover it either in the forty-five books of the Old Testament, or the twenty-seven of the New.

St. Augustine looked upon this task as being above the reach of his genius. How then could it be performed by the immense multitude of men to whom the Church

during the Holy Mysteries reads and explains the Gospel as *the Word of God;* who are taught the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer as things revealed; to whom the Creed chanted at the Altar says that Christ rose again *according to the Scriptures?*

And so much the more, because this first principle ought to be established in the conviction of every one with the very firmest assurance, since it is the principle in consequence of which so many mysterious verities must be admitted, and so many onerous duties must be performed. Is it not evident, that the least doubt as to the authenticity or the inspiration of the Gospels would be sufficient to paralyze all the zeal, which we have to exert in following its precepts and its maxims?

Lastly, when the great God who reigns in Heaven deigns to speak to His creature, is it possible that the Almighty Word which this mere nothing is to obey should continue open to discussion like the word of man, uncertain, more or less probable? Or that it should be only accessible to men of learning and to profound critics? Is it possible that these men should be able to boast of having attained it by force of profound erudition and patient research, and that men in general must accept it only on the authority of the learned—an authority so often ephemeral, always open to dispute, and actually disputed? Must it not rather be that every man possessed of good will is able to hear it with the perfect assurance of faith, but on his knees, after first adoring his Creator and his Lord, and silencing at His feet all his prejudices, his passions, and above all, his pride; repeating with Saul, when God's grace had thrown him to the ground *Lord, what wilt thou have me do.*

In order then to form the complete collection of the sacred books, to secure the adoption of that collection by the whole Christian world, to elicit from all the faithful such an act of faith in their inspiration, as we have described, there was need of a pre-existing authority,

venerated as a divine institution, charged with the care of all the churches, and making itself obeyed from North to South, from East to West. Under the Old law there was need of the ninety-nine Pontiffs, who succeeded to the chair of Moses; since the coming of Jesus Christ there is need of the authority of the Holy Roman Church. Here we see the sole cause which could have produced this universal and perpetual effect; the sole ground which explains and justifies the belief of Christendom in the Scriptures.

And this is what Protestants themselves are beginning to understand. M. Scherer, who is forming a school at Geneva, proves in the following terms that it is the Church alone, recognized as infallible, which can propose the Canon of the Scriptures to the faith of the Christian:[1]

"Unless with the Catholic we attribute a supernatural, infallible authority to the Church, we are compelled to acknowledge, that she may have been deceived, in the formation of the Canon, may have introduced into it books, which did not merit that honor, and excluded others, which would have deserved it more. From this it follows that it is the right, not to say the duty, of every Protestant Christian to decline the authority of the Church in this particular, to revise its judgment, and, if the case arise, to substitute his own. . . . Now what are the consequences of this liberty which Protestantism implicitly recognizes as belonging to the believer? That the question of canonicity, . . . which forms one of the elements of Protestant authority in matters of faith, is a question left to the judgment of each individual; that the rule of authority does not exist in any objective and certain way; that persons may differ in respect to it without ceasing to be Christians; that each individual is called to pronounce upon subjects respecting which doubts and difficulties exist among the most learned; that the simplest believer, before he can be sure of his faith, has to resolve

[1] La critique et la Foi, pp. 13 and 14.

questions of authenticity and canonicity, of criticism and history;—in short, that the cardinal article of the Christian faith, the very foundation of authority, and consequently of the whole religion, which rests on that authority, must itself rest on the moving sand of delicate investigations, of uncertain literary operations; in a word, of studies that are rarely favored with any clear light of evidence. In sooth, this is a fine basis for the faith of the church! a Rule very accessible to the mass of Christian people!"

Let us return to the true rule which the Son of God has Himself given us, namely, the Church. It is not merely true that reason demands her intervention in determining the catalogue of the Sacred Books; history attests that intervention. History proves that the Chair of Peter is the only but unshaken foundation for the Canon of the Scriptures.

St. Clement, third pope after the Prince of the Apostles, in the epistle which he wrote to the church of Corinth, cites, as authoritative, texts from nearly all the books of the Old and New Testaments, those even which are called Deutero-Canonical. A few years later, the church of Rome communicates to the churches of Africa the Canon, which comprises the seventy-two inspired books. Accordingly the council of Hippo, in 393, the third council of Carthage, in 397, St. Augustine about the same time, in his book on Christian Doctrine, repeat it in its integrity. At the beginning of the following century, the Pope, St. Innocent I, sends it to Exuperius of Toulouse; at a later period Pope Gelasius, and in 1435 Eugenius IV., communicate it to recently converted nations. A multitude of inscriptions, sculptures, paintings, collected by Bianchini, Aringhi, and others, prove that from the first ages the books of Baruch, Tobias, Daniel, the Apocalypse, in a word, the Deutero-Canonical books, were regarded as sacred by the Roman Church. Meanwhile, however, the Greek Fathers, whose relations with Rome are less fre-

quent, Melito, Origen, St. Gregory of Nazianzan, the Syrian church, make enumerations more or less defective: some of them class St. Clement, others Hermas among the sacred writers; some cite the third and fourth books of Esdras, others forget to mention the Apocalypse, the Epistle to the Hebrews, or those books of the Old Testament which were not written in Hebrew. In these fathers we recognize disciples who, on certain points, are but imperfectly acquainted with the teaching of their master, but who subscribe in advance to all his doctrines.

As for the heretics we shall presently show in how false a position they were placed with regard to our sacred books. Let us conclude by observing that the Council of Trent, having been called on to declare the faith of the Church in reference to the Canonical Scriptures, could do nothing better than promulgate afresh, as alone of authority, the canon of the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all others: "And if any one," it says, "does not receive all these books, with their parts, as sacred and canonical, let him be anathema!"

It has now been proved that the powerful voice which speaks with full authority in the name of God, was alone able to establish the Canon of the holy books, and demand our faith in their authenticity and inspiration, and each one of us may say with the great Augustine:[1] "For my own part, I should not have believed the Gospel if I had not been influenced by the authority of the Catholic Church." And with Bossuet,[2] "It is through the Church that the Holy Spirit leads us to believe in the Scriptures, and necessarily so, since it is confessedly the Church which puts the Scriptures into our hands." And with Luther himself:[3] "We are compelled to concede to the papists, that they have the word of God; that we received it

[1] Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas. *Cont Epist. fundamenti.* c. v.

[2] Reflexions sur un ecrit de M. Claude.

[3] Commentary on St. John, chap. xvi.

from them, and that without them we should have had no knowledge of it at all."

It is not less certain that *it belonged to the Church, and to her alone, to give that authoritative interpretation of the Scriptures which, in matters of faith and morals, ought to determine their meaning with a sovereign authority obligatory on all.*

The leaders of the Reformation stop us at this point, and say; "The Scriptures have no need of any interpretation." Can it be true? I open the Epistles of St. Peter and I read that in the Epistles of St. Paul there are obscure passages "hard to be understood," and that ignorant and unsettled minds "wrest" them from their true meaning "as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."[1] I turn to the Gospel of St. Luke, and I read that "Jesus opened the understanding of His disciples (who were on the road to Emmaus) that they might understand the Scriptures;"[2] a service which He had often to render to His Apostles, by explaining to them His own words which they had misunderstood. But surely one who asserts that the inspired text is always clear in questions affecting doctrine or morals, only proves that he has never opened a Bible. Certain texts on the procession of the Holy Ghost, and on the indissolubleness of the marriage tie when stained by adultery, have given rise to interminable discussions between the Greeks and Latins. How many other texts divide theologians and moralists! so difficult is it to distinguish in them a command from a counsel, the figurative from the literal sense. When the Quakers infer from the words, "Swear not at all," that we may not swear in any case; and from those others "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," that war is unlawful,—are they right or wrong? When the ancient Anabaptists and the modern Communists claim the authority of the text "They had all things common," for establishing the community of goods,—are

[1] II Peter. iii. 16. [2] Luc. xxiv. 45.

they right or wrong? The book of Exodus says: Keep holy the Sabbath day," from which many have concluded that Saturday ought still to be the day of rest; others that it is sufficient to call the day reserved for the worship of the *Lord*, the *Sabbath*,—are they right or wrong? A woman of Zurich, on reading that we ought to cut off the member that scandalized, cut out her tongue. The Vegetarian Society condemn themselves to perpetual abstinence from meat, in order to obey some other text of the Bible. . . . But to come to an end, let those who see nothing obscure in our sacred books, explain to us the verse: "There are three that give testimony on earth: the spirit, and the water, and the blood." When this verse has been explained we will propose a multitude of others from the Epistle to the Romans, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, etc. We conclude this part of our subject by the following decisive questions: If the Gospel does not need any interpretation, what is the use of Ministers of the Holy Gospel? And if it is so clear, how does it happen that sects the most opposed in their belief base their systems, one as well as another, on texts of the Bible? And how comes it that, according to Bellarmine, these four words, "This is my body," have given occasion to two hundred different explanations? And that, according to Osiander, there have been counted among the partisans of Augsburg alone, twenty different opinions on justification, sixteen on original sin, &c., all supported by Scripture; and that in reference to the sacraments, there are as many theories, called Scriptural, as there are different sects?

Luther therefore might say with truth: "We are mere school boys, incapable of thoroughly understanding one single verse of Scripture, and it is with difficulty we succeed in learning the A. B. C. of it." . . Then, as was his custom, he exaggerated this truth, when he continued: "No one thoroughly masters the Bucolics of Virgil who has not been five years a shepherd. No one understands

the Georgics well, unless he has been five years a farmer. No one thoroughly enters into the meaning of Cicero's letters if he has not been for twenty years engaged in state affairs. In the same way let no one suppose that he is capable of understanding Holy Scripture, unless he has during a hundred years governed the church with the Prophets, with Elias and Eliseus, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and the Apostles."[1]

Scripture then needs interpretation. This is an acknowledged fact. It is with this written law, as with all others. While they continue superior to the human beings, whom they themselves designate as their interpreters, the Scriptures need to have their exact meaning, the extent of their application, their exceptions, their applicability to certain particular cases, determined every day by a council of state which lives, speaks, explains its decisions, and can make itself obeyed. Now in all times and everywhere the Church has claimed the right of interpreting the Scriptures with supreme authority, by the instrumentality of her chief pastors, and above all, of her head. The Jewish priests, Josephus says,[2] had at their head a High Priest, who, assisted with their co-operation, offered the sacrifices, guarded the laws, decided controversies by his final judgment,—with the penalty for the refractory of being punished as guilty of high treason against God. We read in Deuteronomy: "If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment, . . . and thou see that the words of the judges in thy gates do vary; arise, and go up to the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose: and thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time; and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment; and thou shalt do whatsoever they say. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the Priest, who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge,

[1] Table Talk on Holy Scripture [2] Contra Apion. l. ii. n. 23.

that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel."[1]

The Christian Church, charged with instructing not one nation alone, but all people, must have received at least an equal prerogative in the interpretation of the Scriptures, to which, since the coming of Jesus Christ, twenty-seven books have been added. This prerogative does not differ from that of teaching, which our Saviour gave His Church by these words: "Go teach all nations . . . Preach the Gospel to every creature;—teaching all men to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: He that heareth you, heareth me; I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." For as Christ does not favor His Church with new revelations, it follows that the teaching which she must communicate to the world can have no other subject matter than the very utterances of the Incarnate Word, utterances consigned to and deposited in Scripture or tradition. Her whole office, therefore, is to extract the pure gold from those two inexhaustible mines, and to stamp it as current coin: or, to speak without figure, to search for the divine doctrine in the archives of revelation, and to verify and establish its true sense by comparing corresponding texts and different versions; and yet more, by consulting the explanations given from the beginning by Fathers, Doctors, Sovereign Pontiffs, and Councils: after which, in due time and place, she propounds this heavenly doctrine in the most precise and explicit terms, thus breaking the bread of life for her children, and, according to the necessities of the times, bringing forth from her treasury and diffusing over the world, the riches of the early ages and of recent days. And, while she fulfils this sacred duty, she is assisted by the presence of Him *who promised to be with her always even to the end of time*, and of that *guiding Spirit, the Comforter, who was given her in order to bring to her mind all the words* which in the beginning she had gathered from the very lips of her

[1] Deut. xvii. 8–13.

Spouse. Thus the prerogative which she has received of publishing the Gospel with such authority that gainsayers are to be ranked with the heathens and publicans, necessarily involves the prerogative of interpreting it with an authority no less potent and indisputable. In one word, to preach the Gospel and to explain it are evidently parts of the same function.

Now since the day when St. Peter opened the preaching of the Gospel by those words; Virid fratres, oportet impleri Scripturam;[1] and that on which he proclaimed that according to the Divine appointment it was from his lips the Gentiles were to receive the words of the Gospel;[2] the church has ever fulfilled this holy function amid the applause not only of the faithful, but even of all the heretics themselves, whose errors were not on that occasion, touched by her definitions. Thus the Church had explained the sacred books in a sense opposed to the Gnostics; the Arians said: the Gnostics were deservedly condemned. At a later period when she had published an interpretation opposed to that of the Arians, the Nestorians said: the Arians were justly anathematized. The Pelagians in their turn applauded the judgment delivered against the Nestorians. In the last place the Protestants with one voice proclaimed that up to this point the Church had condemned the heresies of the early ages by a legitimate interpretation of Scripture. They repeated in chorus the anathemas uttered by the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, &c.

But as soon as their own errors are in question, they will no longer have any interpretation of the sacred books but the books themselves; and as these remain speechless under the cross-fire of the different explanations, to which they are subjected, the new teachers do not fear to attribute the authority required for interpreting them, which

[1] Act. i. 16.

[2] Ab antiquis diebus Deus in nobis elegit per os meum audire gentes Verbum Evangelii et credere. *Act.* xv. 7.

they refuse to the universal Church—each to his own private examination or his own individual inspiration.

Inspiration, the parent of enthusiasm, of wild mysticism, of fanaticism, of insanity!—Inspiration, which we Catholics do not even attribute to our universal Church, or to our general Councils; for we only believe, and that on the most certain grounds of credibility, that they are assisted in their teaching and preserved from error by that special aid which God could not have promised them in vain. Inspiration, which drove the Anabaptists of Munster and the famous king of Sion, the Mennonites and the Mormons, Fox and the first Quakers, to acts so edifying and a morality so evangelical! Inspiration, which you claim without any evidence, which God has not promised you, which could not produce at the same time interpretations of the sacred text so opposite to each other! Inspiration, of which you make a two-fold use, when you attribute it first of all to Scripture and afterwards to each of its readers; for what need have this man, this woman, this child, whom you call *inspired*, to consult His written oracles, when once the Holy Spirit has Himself spoken to them? As the Anabaptists well remarked to the other pretended Reformers; "Why do you chain down the living spirit to the letter which kills? You push aside the impulses of God, to follow the wanderings of human wisdom. You are Pharisees, who reject the Holy Spirit to lose your money and your time with the Scriptures." Inspiration, which ended by convincing Swedenborg that there were no really inspired books but the Apocalypse and the four Gospels, and that the kingdom of Jesus Christ, as compared with the empire of the Holy Spirit, was the kingdom of darkness!

Individual examination is no better an interpreter. Undoubtedly it may be usefully applied, provided it conforms to the rules wisely laid down by the Church for the study of the sacred books, for the purpose of acquiring and communicating that understanding of them, which is

obtained from the knowledge of language, an acquaintance with the Fathers and a comparison of texts and versions. This kind of private interpretation, which is called *exegesis*, is not forbidden to any one. The Church invites to it all those of her children, who are likely to succeed. But *dogmatic* interpretation, which fixes belief, which imposes itself as an authority, which draws up creeds and confessions of faith, cannot be its work. Individual examination has given a thousand contradictory interpretations to the Word of God; it has invented such dogmas as, according to Schleiermacher, do not on an average last more than fifteen years. It has undertaken to make itself a judge of the intrinsic truth of the divine declarations, and thus to cite the reason of God Himself before the bar of human reason. This kind of presumption has led it to deny all that went beyond its range; everything supernatural; all mysteries, all miracles, and even the inspiration of the sacred books. It has chosen to transform into *myths* everything in sacred history, which departed from the ordinary course of contemporary events. In its eyes the narratives of Moses and of St. Luke have no more reality than the fictions of Ovid or Homer. It has finished by denying with Vatke the personality of Moses; and Strauss and Renan show us what Protestant Rationalism dares to say of the Adorable Person of Jesus Christ.

Thus it appears that it is neither to individual examination nor special inspiration, but to the Church, the Church alone—that it belongs to interpret authoritatively the divine Scriptures. It was the duty of the Council of Trent to proclaim this principle anew, and to condemn the absurd system which refuses this prerogative to the successors of the Apostles, while granting it to men most incapable and unworthy. The council had likewise to reprobate all interpretations of the divine Word which were contrary to the judgment of the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

It remains for us to prove that *the Church has regulated by a wise discipline the use to be made of the Sacred Books.* Thus she speaks by the instrumentality of the Council of Trent:[1] "To the end that this heavenly treasure, which of His infinite bounty the Holy Spirit has given to mankind, may not continue buried and neglected," it is enjoined on all the churches of the christian world, in which it shall be possible to provide means of support for a professor, and on all monastic houses and convents of Regulars, to have henceforward a continuous course of lectures *on the exposition and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.* The churches whose revenues are not sufficient to bear the expenses of a chair of Theology must at least have some Grammar-Masters, who may prepare their pupils to follow at a later period with God's help, the study of the Holy Scriptures.

To the end that in public lectures, as also in disputations, sermons and expositions, persons might know and understand each other, and start from a common, undisputed principle, the Council, without pretending to detract from the value of the original texts and those ancient translations which are not Latin, ordered that in the different exercises, that have a bearing on christian faith and morals, the ancient and commonly received translations, approved by the Church for so many ages, should be held to be of authority—"forbidding its rejection on any pretence whatever." This Latin translation, called the *Vulgate*, is for the most part the work of St. Jerome. It was found so superior to the old Latin version called *the Italic*, or the ancient *Vulgate*, that in the Liturgy, the homilies of the Fathers, the treatises of doctors and theologians, it everywhere prevailed. "All churches use it," says Isidore of Seville, because it is the clearest and the most exact." St. Augustine praises it thus: It has not been possible to charge it with any essential error. "All the authors that I have been able

[1] Sess. v. *De Reformatione.*

to read up to the present time," says Bellarmine, and he cites a number, among others Melchior Canus, Andreas Vega, Sixtus Sinensis, &c., "agree in saying, first, that the Vulgate is to be regarded as exempt from any error, in all that concerns the Catholic faith and morals, and next, that it ought to be continued in public use in churches and schools, even if some faults could be discovered in its pages." The most learned Protestant expositors, as Grotius, Walton, Rauchlin, Kemnitz, Boysen, Michäelis, &c., have expressed the same opinion and the same wish. "The work of St. Jerome," says M. de Laharpe,[1] "deserves to be highly esteemed, as much on account of the severe principles of the translator, as for his learning, and the care he took to consult the Jewish doctors and the versions that had been made before his time." Luther himself admitted that a great number of new translations serve only to confuse the memory, to relax diligence in study, and to increase the obscurity of certain passages.

Further, as the editions of the Vulgate were not all exactly alike, and consequently some of them must be faulty, the Council decreed that a new edition of this translation should be prepared, as correct as possible; a desire which Gregory XIII., Sixtus V. Gregory XIV. and Clement VIII. labored earnestly to accomplish.

The Council did not then maintain that the Vulgate was faultless; it rather implied the contrary, but deemed that it was sufficiently exact in all that regarded faith and morals, that its text, as it is usually heard in the Catholic church,[2] and consequently as it is found in the greater number of copies in use, should be considered sacred and canonical. Thus any preacher citing the Vulgate in the pulpit, is authorized to say: "The Lord has given us this command in the Gospel: *Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo*"[3] And no one could object

[1] Introduction Historique et critique a l'Ancien Testament, p, 89.

[2] Prout in Eccelsia Catholica legi consueverunt, *Decr. de Can. Script.*

[3] St. Matth. xxii. 37.

that it is a false citation, and that the Gospel does not say this anywhere.

As to the translating of the holy books into the vulgar tongue, it has been approved and encouraged, or blamed and condemned, according to circumstances. Suppose that the translation is correct, and placed in the hands of persons of honest minds and docile hearts, the Church rejoices in it; as she is well pleased to see the Hebrew text, the version of the Seventy and the Vulgate of St. Jerome read, studied and meditated on day and night by the most cultivated minds. Thus the Greek translation of the Old Testament widely diffused among the Gentiles, served as a preparation for the preaching of the Apostles. The translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion were employed by the Church herself, and now the ancient Syrian, Arabic, Coptic and other versions are every day used to facilitate the understanding of the original text. So in our modern times several translations have been made by order of the Sovereign Pontiff, and others have been approved and recommended by them.[1]

If, however, the translation is unfaithful; or if, even though correct, it is accompanied by heretical notes or insidious commentaries; or again, if it is distributed, accepted and read as the sole rule of faith, and as intended to replace the teachings of the Pastors of the Church; if it is understood that individual examination or special inspiration ought alone to supply the explanation of it; in such cases the Church, whose duty is to watch over the integrity of this deposit, obeys that order of her Divine Master: "Give not that which is holy to the dogs; neither cast ye your pearls before swine." She accordingly prohibits either this or that particular translation, or the associations formed for diffusing among the people this bread, that has become poison.

[1] See the Brief addressed by Pius VI. to Antonio Martini, Archbishop of Florence, who translated the Bible into Italian, inserted at the beginning of that translation. An English translation of it may be found in some editions of the Douay Bible, on the first page.

The Council of Trent merely forbids printers or booksellers to publish or to sell any book of Scripture, and in general any work treating of sacred subjects, that does not bear the name of its author and the approbation of the Ordinary. It says nothing of the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. But the rules of the Index, established by theologians chosen by the Council and approved by Pius IV. order that it should not be permitted without a wise discrimination; without the same precautions, as the faithful of their own accord impose on themselves, when they would receive the divine Eucharist.

Assuredly there is nothing under heaven better than the Body of the Saviour, nothing more healthful than the Blood which has saved the world. It follows that nothing is more precious than a fervent communion, or more deadly than the reception of the Eucharist by one who is unworthy. The faithful, consequently, of their own accord, prove themselves before approaching the sacred banquet; or rather they submit themselves to the judgment of their confessor, and this without any feeling of opposition or resistance; nay, without any formal law which obliges them to do it, but by a movement which is spontaneous and universal. Well! Such is exactly the practice which the third and fourth rules of the Index prescribe with regard to the reading of the sacred books in the vulgar tongue. The faithful ask permission of their pastors or their confessors; who, being previously provided with the necessary authorization, assuring themselves of the goodness of the translation, grant or refuse the request, permit it in one case, delay it in another. Thus all is done with order and subordination; and these prudent precautions which are but too well justified by the extravagances of freethinkers, sanctify, while they guide, a sober and intelligent liberty. The Jews submitted to corresponding regulations. St. Jerome, St. Basil, and Origen, tell us that before attaining the age of thirty, they could not read certain parts of the Old Testament,—for instance,

the beginning of Genesis, some chapters of Ezekiel and the Canticle of Canticles.

The last regulation of the Council on the subject of the Holy Scriptures forbids, that they should ever be made subservient to unworthy uses; to jesting, to flattery, to evil-speaking, superstition, or sorcery, &c . .

To recapitulate then what we have said; what the Church does for Scripture is this: She precedes it, not in dignity or in excellence, but in order of time; in virtue of her authority, already acknowledged, she establishes the Canon of the sacred books, and elicits the act of faith by which we admit their inspiration; she alone has the right to interpret them *dogmatically* and *juridically*, that is to say, in such a manner that her explanation has the force of law in determining doctrine. Lastly, she has in her latest Council wisely regulated the use which it is proper to make of them.

Let us now see what the Scripture in its turn, does for the Church.

III.

On the relations between the Scripture and the Church.

Scripture, the true word of God, communicated in times past by the prophets and in these last days by His own Son,[1] *is not inferior to the Church in excellence and dignity.* It is inspired, holy and divine. The Church, the faithful bride of Jesus Christ, acknowledges loudly and lovingly that she owes obedience to her Lord; but professes with no less confidence, that she is charged with the duty of conveying to His children the orders of their Father, and also of explaining them in His name, and with the assistance of His Spirit. It is her custom to erect a throne in the middle of her Councils, on which she places the holy books as presiding over the assembly; occupying, as it were, the first place, and deciding with supreme authority. When she celebrates the Holy Mysteries, she wills that

[1] Heb. i. 1–12.

during the reading of the Gospel, all should rise and remain standing as a mark of reverence.

Scripture, entrusted to the Church, is *her light and her treasure.* It is a powerful means furnished her for attaining her end, namely, the bringing about the salvation of men by teaching the doctrine of Jesus Christ, administering His sacraments, promulgating His laws, celebrating His worship.

All the points of Christian doctrine, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent tells us,[1] have relation to the existence and attributes of God, the creation and government of the world, the redemption of the human race, the eternal destiny of the good when recompensed and of the wicked when punished. Now how magnificently is this outline filled up by our sacred books! What pure, holy, elevated sentiments respecting God and Jesus Christ are given in the writings of the Psalmist, the Prophets, the Evangelists, the great Apostle and the Disciple whom Jesus loved! With what sublime simplicity does Moses describe the origin of the world, and St. Luke the first beginning of the Church! How awfully is the sanction of the divine law presented in that two-fold sentence, of which St. Matthew has beforehand supplied the words to be the subject of our meditations, in that history of the miserable rich man preserved for us by St. Luke, and in the fearful picture of the last-times, which has been drawn by the Eagle of Patmos!

Grace is given us by the sacraments, grace, without which no one can attain to glory. Now, is there any of those precious channels whereby the Blood of Jesus Christ flows in upon our souls, of which the institution, the use, the marvellous efficacy, are not told us in the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles?

The decalogue, which Jesus Christ did not come to abolish but to carry on to its perfection, is written in Exodus, developed in the Books of Wisdom, Ecclesias-

[1] Prefat. n. 21

ticus, Proverbs, &c.,—put in practice in Tobias, in Esther, in the Maccabees. The Gospel is the commentary, which Christ has Himself made upon it. As to the legislative authority accorded to the Synagogue and to the Christian Church, the Old and New Testaments serve as its archives. There it has all its title-deeds and a part of its history.

Lastly, St. Matthew and St. Luke have preserved us the form of prayer which the Son of God vouchsafed to teach us. The same Evangelists, together with St. Mark and St. Paul, inform us with what rite our Saviour celebrated His sacrifice in the Supper-room, enjoining on us to offer it after His example. To express to God her adorations, thanksgivings and sorrow for having offended Him—to mourn over the cross and the tomb of Jesus Christ—could the Church do better than borrow from the Prophet-king the expressions of his faith, his repentance and his love, and from Jeremiah his plaints and lamentations? How precious a privilege is it for her to be able to address to God prayers, which He Himself provides for her! It is, says St. Augustine, *de Deo orare Deum!*

Thus, as the Apostle remarks,[1] Scripture provides us with instruments useful "for teaching, reproving, correcting, instructing in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work." In it the field of divine revelation opens and extends itself before us, immeasurable, infinite. In it those ineffable marvels which the Son of God beholds in the bosom of His Father, are related to us by Himself. By it we are made partakers of that blessedness which Jesus Christ has declared to be greater than the divine maternity: "Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it;" and it may be said of us as truly as of His chosen disciples: "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which you see, blessed the ears that hear those things which you hear." It is, then, for the Church, as, according to the Apostle, it was for Israel, a great and peculiar advantage, that she is made the depository of the oracles of God.[2]

[1] II Tim. iii. 16, 17.

[2] See Rom. iii. 2.

And this all the more *that the sacred text confirms the authority of the Church, and cannot in any case weaken it.*

We have already proved the first part of this proposition. We have shown that the institution, the extent, the prerogatives, and the exercise of that power, which Jesus Christ confided to the pastors and the head of the Church, are clearly set forth in Scripture. Now the Word of God cannot contradict Himself: in His utterances there can be no *yea* and *nay*, it is and it is not; what He builds up with one hand, He does not destroy with the other. His Church will be assailed by the continued opposition of the powers of hell, it is true; but she will triumph over their assaults. Without doubt there will be heresies and scandals; nevertheless, even until the end of time the Saviour will be ever present with His Apostles and their successors: and though Scribes and Pharisees should come to sit in the chair of Moses, or in that of Peter, still, even then must we do what they say, without imitating what they do.

It is possible then, that I may see the defects and the vices of some pastors of the Church branded and fulminated against by our sacred books, but never will it be possible that a text of the Bible should contradict the dogma or the morals proclaimed officially by the Church herself; and if an Angel from Heaven came to assert such a contradiction to me, I should say to him: Anathema![1] Thus an opposition between the sacred text and any of the Catholic dogmas can only be apparent; or, it may be, the translation which I have before me is faulty;[2] or, the text is really obscure and needs to be explained by means of other texts;[3] or, notwithstanding that it is expressed absolutely, it only contains an advice;[4]

[1] See Galat. i. 8, 9.

[2] Such are the translations which say that "a Bishop must have," instead of "*must have had, only one wife.*"

[3] Such is the famous text, Matth. v. 32.

[4] For instance, Matth. v. 40; Luc. xiv. 12; xii. 33, etc.

or again, it attributes to one cause alone an effect, which that cause could not produce without the concurrence of others, mentioned elsewhere;[1] or, in fine, however clear the text may be, I understand it wrongly, from not knowing the genius of the language, not distinguishing between the figurative and the literal sense.[2]

From the time the Church came into existence, there is scarcely a single verse of Scripture which heresy has not sought to make use of as a weapon against her; and yet every enlightened and impartial person is compelled to admit that not one of these texts is conclusive against her doctrine, and that a multitude of other very clear passages serve as the foundation and the proof of her teaching.

Scripture, considered as a whole, studied with an honest understanding and a teachable heart, and interpreted according to the consent of the Fathers, could not, in any case, be favorable to schism or heresy. But suppose that these conditions are wanting, the case will be quite otherwise. With a perverse or a proud understanding, that is fond of singularity and cannot walk in the common path, especially when the path is pointed out by obedience, with a heart greedy of deceptions, which may absolve and tranquillize it,—how easy is it for any one, after he has once declared himself in favor of a system and gained partisans to it, to find in some one of the versions of some one of the seventy-two books of Scripture, a single verse which he can turn with apparent advantage against some one of the doctrines of the Church!

What does any one think of it, who knows the teachings of this church,—teachings so pure and so lofty—and the laws she imposes on us—laws often so burdensome to our passions; and the numerous difficulties which present themselves at every page of our sacred books, and, above

[1] See the texts cited by the Council of Trent, in its statement of the doctrine of justification, c. vi. at the end.

[2] See Bécan, *Manuale controv.* l. i. c. 1. *quæst.* 5.

all, the unfathomable mysteries of iniquity which are concealed in the human heart?

What does he think of it, who knew the resources of chicanery well enough to say; "Give me two lines of a man's handwriting, and I will find the means of hanging him?"

What does St. Augustine think of it, who attributes[1] the rise of heresies and of those pernicious errors, which lead to the damnation of souls, to two causes: first, that men understand the Scriptures wrongly; then, that they maintain presumptuously and audaciously, what they thus understand wrongly?

Did not the Adamites find in the book of Genesis that they were as pure as our first parents and need not be ashamed of being naked any more than they?—and the Ophites that the serpent, which seduced Eve, was Jesus Christ in person? Have not the histories of Cain, of the inhabitants of Sodom procured worshippers for those greatest of sinners? Did not Arius discover in forty-two passages of the Bible that the Son of God was not consubstantial with the Father? Did not Macedonius read in Scripture that the Holy Spirit was not God?—and Pelagius that man could work out his salvation without grace? Did not Luther find in Isaiah that man was not free?[2] And did not Calvin from these very words, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," draw the conclusion, that it is impossible to observe the divine commands? Have not those four words of Jesus Christ, "This is my body," convinced the Sacramentaries and the Calvinists, that the object of which He spoke was not His body? When the monk Luther felt that those words of Genesis; "Non est bonum esse hominem solum,"—called on him to desert his convent and to marry a nun; when a member of the English Parliament, in order to sanction

[1] Non aliunde natæ sunt hæreses nisi dum Scripturæ bonæ intelliguntur non bene. *In Joan.* tr. xv ii.

[2] Is. xli. 23.

the adulterous union of Henry VIII. with Anna Boleyn, used the authority of that text of the first book of Kings; "quia Annam diligebat," "because *he* (Elcana) *loved Anna*," we can understand that there is no error so monstrous, no crime so detestable, but that, with a little invention and audacity, it may be justified by some particular passage of Scripture.

What must be the result, if the wild fanaticism of a sectary believes itself bound by the word of God to silence all contradiction, and to use every means to make the gospel of its own invention prevail? Julian the Apostate closed the school of the Christians and took away from them their property, to oblige them to imitate the poverty and simplicity of Jesus Christ. It was in the name of the God of Abraham, in the name of the great prophet of the Christians, that Mahomet brought back Judaism and Christianity to the fatalism and morals of paganism. How many images, statues, reliquaries, altars, has not the fourth verse of the twentieth chapter of Exodus broken in pieces? How many priests has not the sixth verse of the nineteenth chapter massacred? How many vows have not been broken by that half verse of Genesis: *Crescite et multiplicamini*? The man who says that he is authorized by God Himself to silence His oracles, to demolish His temples, to give the lie to His ministers, places himself in a position as false as it is sacrilegious, and the aberrations of his understanding cannot absolve his impious audacity. He uses the authority of God in opposition to God Himself; he imposes his falsehoods and blasphemies on the Holy Spirit. He makes the desires of his own heart and his dreams by night, divine oracles, which all the world is to believe; he calls to his aid Prophets, Apostles, Fathers, Councils, to consummate his work, a work which Scripture calls a "travailing with error;" and while he assumes the character of a Nehemiah, restoring the temple of the Lord, and purifying His sanctuary, he is in reality only an Attila, obeying an infernal instinct.

which urges him on to burn Rome, and to gain the title of the scourge of God!

It follows from what we have said, that the reading of the sacred books may be productive of great good or great mischief, according as the version is correct or unfaithful, and the disposition brought to the study good or bad. And, since the Church is charged with the duty of teaching all necessary truths, and performs that duty by explaining to all, the elements of Christian truth, with the help of a catechism made by order of the Council of Trent and translated into the vulgar tongue,[1] and as she reverts to these instructions every Sunday during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries,—it follows further, that, as a general rule, the reading of Holy Scripture is not necessary for salvation to any layman, as we have inferred already from another principle.

The good relations which must of necessity subsist between these two divine works, Scripture and the Church, are very faithfully recalled by the following passage, which we read in the eighth chapter of the Acts:

Philip the deacon had been evangelizing the city of Samaria. The Angel of the Lord said to him: Arise, go towards the south, to the way which goes from Jerusalem to Gaza.

Philip rises and takes the road pointed out to him; and behold he meets with an Ethiopian, treasurer of Candace, the queen of Ethiopia, who had been offering sacrifices at Jerusalem, and was returning, sitting in his chariot and reading the Prophet Isaiah.

And the Spirit of God said to Philip: Go near, and join thyself to the man who is riding in his chariot.

Philip approaches and hearing him reading a passage of Isaiah, says to him: "Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?"

"And how can I understand it," answered the Ethiopian, "if no one explains it to me?"

[1] Sect. 24, *De Reform.*, c. vii

And on saying these words he desired Philip to come up and sit beside him.

Now the passage which he was reading was this: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb without voice before his shearer, so openeth he not his mouth," &c: I beseech you, said the Eunuch to Philip, tell me of whom the Prophet is speaking here? Is it of himself or of some one else?

And Philip, beginning with the explanation of this text, told him of Jesus.

And as they went on their way they found some water, and the Ethiopian said to Philip, See here is water! why should you not give me baptism?—If you believe with all your heart, I can baptize you, was the reply of the Apostle.—Yes, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And saying these words, the Ethiopian commanded the chariot to stop. They went down together and Philip baptized him.

And immediately the Spirit of God took away the Apostle; and his companion saw him no more; and while he continued his journey with his heart full of joy, Philip was found transported to Azotus, and he preached the gospel to all the cities of that country as far as Cesarea.

In this history Philip represents to us the Church. It is to her that it belongs to explain to us the sacred books, which she received from her Divine Spouse, together with the Spirit who alone can fathom their mysteries. Here are contained her title deeds, her history, and the most beautiful hymns to the glory of God, inspired by Himself. It is for us to say like the Ethiopian, "How can I understand this language of infinite depth, if I do not have the interpretation given me?" The Church and Scripture, therefore, ought to go together, in perfect harmony, guiding the Elect to heaven. It behooves us also to act like this treasurer of Candace; to obey without delay, without resisting the divine will, made known to us by the Word of God, explained by the Church. "See

here is water, why should I not be baptized?" Or, it may be, "Here is the bath of penitence, why should I not seek a new baptism?" Or, again, "This is evidently the true Church of Jesus Christ, why should I delay to acknowledge her authority? why put off till to-morrow what ought to be done to-day? To-morrow perhaps the minister of Jesus Christ will be carried far away. Since it is a duty to obey, surely, the sooner it is done, the safer and better.

IV.

Of heresy in its relation to Scripture.

We have shown what Scripture is for the Church, and what the Church is for Scripture. It remains for us now in a few words to exhibit the relation of heresy to our sacred books.

Heresy, if we look to its etymology, is a choice (αἵρεσις), which man makes among revealed truths, without respect for the supreme authority of God who is justly offended when His creature draws distinctions, in a matter in which He Himself makes no distinction,—no longer obeying on this general ground, "It is revealed, therefore it must be believed."—Following rather the directions of his understanding or the secret sympathies of his heart, the heretic virtually says to God, (and as soon as he maintains this saying with obstinacy, he becomes a *formal* heretic): "Speak, if you will; I still reserve to myself, however, the right of examining your words, and admitting those only among them which appear to myself to be true, consistent and useful." It follows that such a man, even when by virtue of this choice he still holds to some of the articles revealed, is no longer submitting to a divine revelation; not even to the revelation of those particular truths, which he thinks it right to retain; for as soon as he has in his own case set aside the universal ground of faith, the authority of a revealing God, these truths have assumed a new position in his

mind. Instead of being bound to submit his reason to these articles, he rather subjects them to his reason; if he admits them, it is not as being revealed, but simply, all things considered, as being true or probable. He sins therefore not only against the faith due to the dogmas which he rejects, but also against the faith claimed by those which he retains, and against the Christian and Catholic faith in general, and we may say that he loses this faith.

1. *Heresy*, therefore, by the very fact that it has rejected the authority of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, *no longer possesses the ground or motive requisite for believing in the inspiration of the holy books.*

We have shown that the sole ground or motive for believing in our dogmas, and especially in that now in question, the inspiration of the Scriptures, was their revelation by God, propounded to us by the Church. Setting this authority aside we no longer see anything which demands or anything which can obtain this faith. It is not on the word of a minister, of a consistory, of a synod, nor yet to satisfy the needs of the mind and the heart; neither is it on the affirmation of one sect or of many, nor even of those persons who believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, that we can make an act of faith with regard to such a fact. For, from the moment that you deny the divine institution and power of the Church, these men are all in your eyes no more than a merely human authority. According to your view they affirm this fact, as they would affirm the authenticity of the Æneid or the Iliad, with this difference, that the authenticity of the Æneid can be established by human testimony, and the inspiration of the Bible cannot. Such human testimony requires nothing from you beyond an act of assent of this kind: The Æneid is probably or certainly the work of Virgil. Whether you assent to this or not is for you a question of sound logic; it could never be a religious question. It follows that a man who has said

in his heart, "I do not believe in the Church," cannot, without inconsistency, add; "I do believe in the Scriptures:" and if, notwithstanding, he were to make an act of faith in the inspiration of his New Testament, it would be because, for the need of the moment, and, most probably, without being conscious of it, he had reconstructed in his mind that sacred foundation—the authority of the Church—which he had already unhappily attempted to overthrow.

This impossibility of obtaining faith in the inspiration of the sacred writings from learning, left to itself, is at the present day acknowledged by a great number of Protestants. Schérer has demonstrated[1] that neither the nature of the sacred books itself, nor the assertion of its author; neither the testimony of the Holy Spirit, nor the need which Protestants feel of having an infallible rule of faith in place of the Church, can be the ground of such faith. "Belief in inspiration, therefore," he concludes, "has no foundation to rest upon."

But if the Protestant can rest his faith in the Scriptures only on the authority of the Church, it follows that he places himself in contradiction with himself, when he alleges the Scriptures in opposition to the authority of the Church. And yet this is the strange phenomenon which heresy presents to our view: thousands, nay, millions of men continually receive from the hands of the Roman Church, but without admitting it, certain books the inspiration of which they know only on the authority of her teaching: and nevertheless they spend their lives in throwing the pages of these sacred books in the face of the Church, with a thousand charges of imposture! like children who tear the breast of their mother, even when it nourishes them with its purest milk; or like those wretched beings whom Jesus Christ cured of their infirmities, and who, in the days of His Passion, turned against Him the strength which He had Himself given

[1] *La Critique et la Foi.*

them; or even like those Scribes and Pharisees who, having been brought into existence out of nothing by the voice of the Word, endeavored to find that Word, when incarnate, at fault in His sayings, and cried out that He blasphemed when He declared to them—I am the Son of God!

2. *Heresy*, not being able to make an act of faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, having nothing more than a purely human certainty or probable persuasion of its truth, *is almost of necessity led to allow itself strange liberties with them.*

In fact, since there is no longer any authority, acknowledged as divine, to oblige me to accept the inspiration of the sacred books as a dogma as certain as the very existence of God, to give me their true meaning, to tell me what version is authentic, and according to what rules I ought to read such version for my own instruction or circulate it for the edification of others, are matters on which I evidently retain my liberty full and entire.

I may therefore, and I even ought to subject to a cautious doubt, and then to a serious examination all these propositions which are dogmas for Catholics, but which are still uncertain questions for me: "Do there exist any Scriptural books which are authentic, true, preserved in their integrity, inspired?—what is their number?—where is the faithful text or at least the correct translation of them to be found?—what is their orthodox sense?

Now, if the only hindrance to the certain solution of such problems were the limits of the human understanding, we can easily conceive how difficult the discovery of the truth on these various points would be for all, how impossible for the great majority. But how greatly is this difficulty aggravated, when the desire to propagate a system, the love of novelty, the spirit of contradiction, the fear of arriving at the truth, enter into the question! We must then expect soon to see the most ill-considered and contradictory opinions appearing.

Tertullian says of the Marcionites: "They add to the Scriptures or take from them as suits their own system."[1] St. Irenæus brings the same charge against the heretics of his time.[2] St. Cyprian, in his book on the Unity of the Church calls them, *corrupters of the Gospel.* St. Augustine said of the Manichees that, "by a privilege or rather a sacrilege peculiar to themselves, they accept what part of the Scriptures they like, and reject what they do not like."[3] As to our modern heretics, one of their own writers has admitted that the mere wish to avoid certain difficulties, which were alleged against them from the deutero-canonical books, led them to reject these writings.[4] If they preserve them in their Bibles, it is in order that the Protestant Bible may not look less voluminous and so less complete than the Catholic Bible.[5] On the authority of another Protestant (Hænighaus), Audin thus summarily states the results of the critical operations that have been made by the pretended Reformation on our holy books:

"Luther disputes the authenticity of the Apocalypse and the Epistle of St. James, (He throws Esther into the Elbe, calls Judith a poem, Tobias a farce, and regrets that the second book of the Maccabees has come down to us. He attributes the writings of the prophets to their disciples and hearers, who were not afraid to make additions to them afterwards.)[5] Veter (in company with Fulda, Hasse, Bertholdt, &c.,) maintains that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses. De Wette affirms that the authority of the book of Kings is very doubtful. Carlstadt rejects the books of Samuel and Esdras.[6] Staffner treats the book of Judith as a pious romance. Bretschneider denies that the Psalms and the canticles of Solomon are inspired . . . Michaelis calls the book of

[1] *De Præscript.* c. xvii.
[2] *Cont. Hœres.* lib. i. c. 20.
[3] *De bono persev.* c. xi. n. 26.
[4] Moulinié, *Notice sur les livres apocryphes.*
[5] Synod of Berlin. *Univers,* June 22, 1852.
[6] i.e. Ezra and Nehemiah in the Protestant Bibles.

Jonas a pretty tale. Wegscheider maintains that the book of Daniel was certainly not written by that Prophet. Schultz and Schultless do not believe in the Gospel of St. Matthew. Staudlin insists that the Gospel of St. John was the work of some sage of Alexandria. Eichhorn is convinced that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke were composed from an ancient Aramaic document. Geisse affirms that none of the gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear. (This is also the opinion of Herder, Lekermann, Géissler, &c.) Claudius thinks that the Epistles of St. John are by some Jew, whose name has not come down to us. Schleiermacher attacks the authenticity of the first Epistle to Timothy. Baumgarten Crusius maintains that the Epistle to the Hebrews is by an Alexandrian philosopher .... Schérer affirms that the Epistle of Jude makes use of fables, and that the Apocalypse has seen its predictions falsified by facts, &c.

"Where then is Holy Scripture?" exclaims the Protestant Doctor Rose, "since there is not a syllable of the old and new Testament which is not rejected by some learned German, not in the obscurity of a humble study, but openly in broad daylight, and often under the eye of the prince whose pensioner he is? Henceforth then," he concludes, "let no one cite texts of Scripture in support of doctrines; without tradition it would be impossible to prove that the old or the new Testament contains the Word of God."[1]

After having allowed themselves so much license on the question of the authenticity of the Holy Scripture, will they be more circumspect when they explain their views as to its *truth?* Did not Luther say, "Scripture is the servant, Christ the master; keep to the servant and let alone the master?"[2] And did not Calvin, to prop up his system of predestination, invent a *secret* will of God

[1] La Réforme contra la Réforme. Introduction by Audin.

[2] Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.

(*arcana* or *beneplaciti*,) opposed to the will revealed in Scripture, (which he calls *revelata* or *voluntas signi*;) a theory which leads to the conclusion that the sacred pages sometimes say what is untrue? Even if Scripture contained this doctrine in the clearest terms, I would not believe it, said Socinus. Lemler accuses St. Paul of gnosticism. According to Claudius, superintendent of a Protestant church, "the doctrine of St. Matthew is overburdened with foreign additions, and it could not be used as a rule of faith. The Gospel and Epistles of St. John are not his, but the work of some Jew. They contain several things which are blameable and contradictory. Their devotion is gnostic. Paul in his Epistles, has not given up his Jewish ideas; he continues to believe in the divine character of the Jewish religion, and admits a real resurrection of the flesh; and the doctrine of Providence is not to be found in him. The Epistles of Peter and James and that to the Hebrews are like those of Paul; in general, the writings of the New Testament would not produce a well connected and well evidenced body of doctrine." The same author does not shrink from accusing Jesus Christ Himself of falsehood and perjury.

As to the inspiration of the sacred books, it has been denied by Lemler, Ammon, Paulus, Eichhorn, de Wette, &c. Michaelis and Rosenmuller only admit it as regards a part of Scripture. The naturalist school, founded by Kant and Fitche, identify inspiration with poetic enthusiasm. Many altogether abstain from speaking on the subject. Some admit, that independently of Catholicism, the existence of inspiration could not be proved. Accordingly the *Theopneustic* theologians, that is those who maintain a supernatural inspiration, properly so called, are becoming ever more and more rare. The freër thinkers do not hesitate to designate it as a superannuated belief, a chimera, and an obstacle to progress. Shèrer calls it *a cabalistic ventriloquism*. According to him, the operation of the Spirit in the Apostles, does not differ at all in its

nature from that which every believer ought to expect, and which it is his duty to desire. . . . It preserves from error only in such proportion as sin produces error, and holiness understanding. It depends on the person who receives it, as much as on the Spirit which communicates it." Swedenborg made the Spirit which dictated the Scriptures, subordinate to that by which he was himself inspired.

To arrive at this point they must have adopted a singular mode of interpretation in regard to the sacred books. That system, which prevails in the majority of the Protestant schools, consists in explaining everything in such a way that miracle, prophecy, mystery, in a word *the supernatural*, entirely disappears. To the clear-sighted view of Wegscheider, Heyne, Niebuhr, &c., these all vanish as soon as we master the idea of a *myth*. Myths, which must have been singularly captivating to the vivid and highly colored imaginations of the earliest races of mankind; which must have supplied the deficiencies of their language, while it was yet poor and limited, and, by leaving a deeper impression on the memory, have helped to preserve and propagate their traditions: these myths are nothing else than allegories, clothing with a miraculous, historical form mere natural events or purely philosophical ideas. Thus the temptation and fall of our first parents, the tower of Babel, &c., are poems describing the internal struggles of good and evil. The Incarnation, as related in the gospels, is only a myth representing the union of the human Word or reason with the flesh in humanity. The appearance of the Angels at the Birth of Jesus was nothing more than a fiery meteor. The narrative of His temptation in the desert is, in the eyes of Eichhorn, Augusti, and others, the history of the ambitious thoughts which arose in the mind of Jesus while He was in the desert preparing Himself for His ministry. The voice which was heard at the time of His Baptism, was the sound of thunder, and the flight of a pigeon

which at that moment crossed the sky was mistaken for the appearance of the Holy Spirit. The history of the transfiguration is explained by a violent storm; the miraculous cures by the medical knowledge, and the magnetic influence which Jesus exercised, and the great confidence which He inspired. His death on the cross was only fainting. His Resurrection and Ascension are beauful allegories, expressive of the ultimate victory of truth over error and mind over matter. A few white cloths spread upon His tomb by some washerwomen were taken for angels, &c., &c.[1]

After allowing themselves such licence in the interpretation of the sacred text, they saw clearly that they had no longer any need to falsify it. But at an earlier period, was not Luther caught translating *justificari hominem per fidem*, by *man is justified by faith only?* And how did he justify himself for this temerity? By the insolent reply: "If your papist pretends to make a great noise about this addition of the word *sola*, tell him that Doctor Martin Luther wills it to be so, and that he says that a papist and an ass are the same thing: *sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas!* We will not be disciples of the papists, who regard it as a sin to falsify Scripture, but of their master, &c."[2] In virtue of this principle that intrepid forger allowed himself to give a false and heretical sense to fourteen hundred texts of Scripture.

His example was followed by Theodore Beza, Castalio, Tyndal, and others. Richard Simon has brought to light some of Beza's falsifications, to have a thorough appreciation of which it is said to be necessary to consult the seven editions of his new Testament, which are very different, one from another.[3] Beza calls Castalio's translation childish and impious. Luther would not hear the

[1] See Audin, *Vie de Luthur*, t. ii. p. 376.

[2] In a pamphlet entitled, *Answer to two questions.*—See Dollinger, *The Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 148.

[3] *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, t. xix. p. 414.

Zurich translation spoken of: they of Zurich rejected that of Munster. But we may spare ourselves this detail, Grotius, like an impartial Protestant, admitted that the versions of Beza, Piscator, etc., cease to be correct as soon as the interests of controversy require it.[1] The Anglican church, represented by a thousand of its ministers, condemned, as full of errors, the first three translations of the sacred book, which had led to the conversion of England to Protestantism. Thus while the leaders of the sects accommodate, not their doctrines to the Scriptures, but the Scriptures to their doctrines, the great body of their followers take for their rule of faith, not the Scripture, (for Scripture is assuredly the same everywhere and for all), but the translation of it which has been fabricated for their use: and yet, according to St. Jerome, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, when it is misinterpreted, is nothing more than a human gospel, or, what is worse, a diabolical one.[2]

The multiplication and diffusion through every country of these incorrect, incomplete translations, offered, as they are, to all comers, can only increase confusion, sow tares, inspire contempt for Scripture itself, and, owing particularly to the commentaries and so called *religious* tracts circulated by the colporteurs create or strengthen unjust prejudices against the Church; in one word, can have no other effect than that of weakening faith or leading it astray; especially since the persons who receive these books believe that they are *ipso facto* authorized to set aside entirely the directions of the Church, their teacher. Now such, on the admission of Protestants themselves, are precisely the results obtained within the last fifty years by the immense treasures and labors of their Bible societies.[3] Without speaking of the persecutions which they have raised up against Catholics, the scandal they have caused to unbelievers, Dr. Hook has

[1] *Votum pro pace.* p. 674. [2] In cap. 1. *Epist. ad Galat.*

[3] See *La lecture de la Bible en langue vulgaire,* par Mgr. Malon. t. ii.

proved by figures that seven years after the origin of these societies, the number of crimes had already doubled; that in the year 1817 it had become threefold what it was previously. "Since the beginning of the present century," says the Religious Guide, a Protestant journal at Berlin, "thirty-two millions of Bibles have been published in two hundred different languages, and have been distributed in all parts of the world by five thousand Bible Societies. Now what has been the result of all this outlay of zeal and money? religious progress? the moral advancement of the people? No. But on the contrary, an incontestible and profound deterioration."[1] The savages lose no time in exchanging Bibles that are distributed among them, for brandy and other intoxicating liquors. In China thousands of Bibles have been sold at auction, and bought by shoemakers who make soles of their bindings. In Gambier Island, one of the Sandwich Islands, the distribution of the Reformed Gospel has only succeeded in causing the Catholic Missionaries to be driven away. It is therefore with good reason that Pius VII., Leo XII., Gregory XVI., condemned the Bible Societies, both in the interest of the true faith, and of the books which contain it.

Let us pause here. We have established the following facts: The Church, in order of time, precedes the Scripture; she alone, by her divine authority previously recognized, is able to establish the Canon of the holy Books and make their inspiration an object of faith. She alone can, with infallible authority, determine their true meaning and their legitimate use.

On the other hand, the Scriptures are a powerful assistance to the Church in attaining her end; they confirm her authority by their testimony, and cannot invalidate any of her decisions: but when misinterpreted and misunderstood, they are condemned to become, in the hands of heresy, a terrible weapon against the truth.

[1] *Univers.* 17 September, 1351.

Meanwhile heresy, by rejecting the authority of the Church, deprives itself of the true ground on which it ought to have had faith in the Scriptures. It cannot therefore logically use them against the church; and by the very fact that, resting on human testimony, it has no more than a purely human faith in them, it is fatally drawn on to question their authenticity, to deny their inspiration, to explain them arbitrarily, to translate them in a way favorable to its errors, and to circulate these unfaithful translations, without any advantage as to the conversion of the world, and with innumerable dangers to the true faith.

This struggle, in which heresy engages against Scripture and the Church, while both alike condemn it, is well represented in the following narrative from St. Matthew and St. Luke:

Jesus, filled with the Holy Ghost, had passsd forty days in the desert, wrestling against hunger and against temptation, in order to give us His great example. In vain does the evil spirit invite Him to turn stones into bread; in vain does he promise Him the possession of the whole world if He will consent to adore him; Jesus brings all these attacks to nothing, by opposing to them the sacred texts of the law.

But now the tempter has recourse to an extreme measure. He leads Jesus to Jerusalem, and into the temple, even to the pinnacle of the temple, and there citing a text of the Psalms, he says to Him; "The Lord hath given His angels charge over thee, and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest perhaps thou dash thy foot against a stone." Consequently, if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from here.

Such was the last expedient and the supreme effort of the tempter. A temptation more terrible than hunger after fasting forty days, more seducing than the promise of a whole world offered to the ambition of man. In order to drive Jesus from Jerusalem and the temple, Satan him-

self undertakes to introduce Him into Jerusalem and into the temple; becoming the zealous advocate of Moses and the Prophets, he opposes the law to the Law, the word to the Word, and David to Jesus Christ. Those who shudder at the sight of evil, the Angel of darkness, transforming himself into an Angel of light, endeavors to deceive by the appearance of good. When he utters blasphemies we recognize him, and flee from him with horror; when he repeats the Psalms, we naturally listen to him with a teachable mind, and cannot but follow counsels which doubtless are inspired by the Holy Ghost.

No. Jesus Christ continues inaccessible to seduction, as He showed Himself superior to ambition and to hunger. "Be gone, Satan," He replied, "It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Thus it is the true Christian foils all the artifices of the enemy, by continually remembering the commandments of his God. Thus it is that to texts fraudently misinterpreted by the sectaries, the Church opposes a clear and definite statement of Holy Scripture.

It is said that on this, Satan, being vanquished, departed from Him *for a time:* for soon under the mask of Arius, Nestorius, Pelagius, &c., he renewed his attacks on Jesus Christ in the person of His Church. This demon, the most obstinate and persevering of all the inhabitants of hell, is called *Heresy.*

The Council of Trent having defined the authority of Scripture and that of tradition in one and the same decree, we shall not give the text of it till after the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

On Tradition.

Fourth Session of the Council of Trent.

I.

True idea of Catholic Tradition.

The Word of God is speaking on earth. He has chosen twelve Apostles and seventy-two disciples to be the constant hearers of His teaching; during three years He instructs them with the most special care, so that He is able to say to them: "All things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you."[1] The subjects of His conversations, as well before as after His Resurrection, is the *Kingdom of God*,[2] that is, the Church, its doctrine, its morals, its discipline. He charges His ambassadors to transmit His instructions to the world just as they had received them; to secure the observance of all that He had commanded; to preach His Gospel to every creature; and in order to assist them in this ministry, He pledges Himself to continue with them till the end of time. Further, He promises to surround their chief with the privileges of special assistance and graces. He prays for him, that his faith never failing, he may always confirm his brethren; He establishes him as the foundation of His Church, the pastor of His flock; He gives him the keys of His kingdom.

And this is not all. The Saviour announces that He will pour out upon them His Consoling Spirit, the Paraclete; not for a time only, but "that He may abide with

[1] Omnia quæcumque audivi a Patri meo, nota feci vobis. *Joan.* xv, 15.
[2] Loquens de regno Dei. *Act.* i. 3

them for ever;"[1] the Spirit of Truth, who was *to bring to their minds all that He had said to them*, and to explain the instructions which He had given them orally;[2] and that so perfectly, that having this Spirit in the midst of them, they will no more need His sensible presence, or to receive from Heaven a second Teacher like Himself, to come and instruct them: *Non necesse habetis ut aliquis doceat vos, sed sicut unctio ejus docet vos de omnibus, verum est.*[3]

The Apostles have such confidence in these promises and receive on the day of Pentecost such an abundance and outpouring of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, that, at the Council of Jerusalem, they do not hesitate to express their decisions in these terms, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,"[4] whom that Spirit assembles together. And in drawing up the Creed, after expressing their faith in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, they add, "I believe the holy Catholic Church:" *Credo Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam.*

Those instructions which the Word of God addressed to His Apostles orally, but which they have not committed to writing, together with those which the Holy Spirit dictated to them and which they were to transmit to the universal church, are called TRADITION.

The definition of the Council is clear. "There are truths and rules of conduct[5] contained in unwritten teaching, which being received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ Himself, or delivered by the Apostles themselves under the dictation of the Holy Ghost, have come down as from hand to hand even to us: these *traditions* the Council receives and venerates with the like piety and reverence as it does the Holy Scriptures."

[1] Ut maneat vobiscum in æternum. *Joan*, xiv, 16.
[2] Suggeret vobis omnia quæcumque dixero vobis. *Joan.* xiv, 26.
[3] 1 Joan. ii. 27. [4] Acts. xv. 29. [5] Veritatem et disciplinam.

II.

Authority of Tradition.

It is evident that tradition, as understood by the Council, that is, a revelation of God not consigned to our sacred books, cannot, as such, be repudiated by any one. To reject it would be to treat with contempt the words of God Himself; it would be, in effect, to say insolently to Him: I will only believe you on this one condition, that you take the trouble to send me your instructions in writing.—Protestants cannot dispute this principle.

Why then do not they agree with us in this article of tradition? For this reason. They assert that all that Jesus Christ said to His Apostles, all that the Holy Spirit could have communicated to them by inspiration, has been registered by them in the Scripture, whence they conclude that tradition, as defined by the Council of Trent, and which certainly could not but have been admitted if it existed, is not to be admitted—for the simple reason that it has no existence in fact.

1. What strikes us at the very first in this assertion is, that it is necessarily a mere *gratuitous assumption*, without any evidence whatever. How do our opponents know, in fact, that the Apostles and Evangelists wrote down all that our Lord came to reveal? Do they read anywhere in Scripture that Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles to write, and to write everything; that He promised all their writings should be preserved; or again, that He enjoined on the faithful to believe nothing that was not written? And did the Saviour say nothing, did the Holy Spirit teach nothing to those Apostles who have written nothing? And those who wrote, did they themselves, in laying down the pen, lose all communication with the Spirit of God?

2. This assertion is not only gratuitous, it is *improbable;* nay, it is manifestly *false*, it is even *absurd*. For if Jesus

Christ had required us to believe the Scriptures only, He would have introduced into the world, a principle that was *new*, *impracticable*, *subversive of religion*, *favorable to all heresies*. A principle that was *new*. From the beginning of the world till the time of Moses it must have been a duty to believe in an unwritten revelation, or in tradition. From the time of Moses almost to the advent of the Messiah, those who found salvation outside the Jewish nation had faith in tradition alone; and it was only by tradition that the Jews themselves knew several dogmatic truths; original sin, for instance, and the means of being purified from it, the true Canon of the Scriptures, &c. . . . "Under the dispensation of the written law," says Molitor,[1] "the most important doctrines were not consigned to Scripture, and there existed among the Jews a sacred tradition which contained more of the chief doctrines of religion than are written in the inspired volume; such as the Trinity, original sin, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, the future Incarnation. The Sadducees rejected these traditions. In the first page of one of the oldest and most esteemed religious treatises of the Jews, which is used in Italy, for the elementary teaching of their children, it is said that besides the written revelation, Moses also received on Sinai an oral and traditional revelation which he transmitted to the Priests. It is to this tradition that our Saviour appealed.[2] Moses, the Judges, David, and others of the inspired writers frequently referred the Jews to it.[3] The traditions of the Pharisees and the Heathens only are condemned.

Jesus Christ would have introduced an *impracticable* principle. For men cannot be brought to believe in a written revelation, or in the Scriptures, except by means of a living, speaking, acting authority, which first gains

[1] *Philosophie de l'histoire et de la tradition.*

[2] Matth. xxiii. 2.

[3] Exod. xiii. 8.—Deut. xxxii. 7.—Judic. vi. 13.—Ps. lxxvii. 5.

their faith, as an ever faithful echo of the revelation, and as in a certain sense a divine tradition incarnate in the flesh in the midst of mankind. "If we reject unwritten tradition," says St. Basil, "we reduce the gospel to an empty name."[1]

Jesus Christ would have laid down a principle *subversive of religion and favorable to all kinds of heresy.* For, in fact, no book explains itself; all its expressions, even the most clear, are susceptible of different interpretations, as we too well know. If then it had been the will of Jesus Christ that the Scriptures alone should possess authority, in a few years after His death, the Church would have been nothing but a swarm of sects, and Christianity would have died with Him, never to rise again. This is the explanation of that instinctive hatred which all Heretics,—Arians, Macedonians, Eutychians, Pelagians, vowed against tradition.[2]

3. But is it not the fact that Protestants are obliged to allow, at least by their practice, that the absolute rejection of tradition is *absurd* and *impracticable?* They admit the Scriptures and a multitude of doctrinal or moral truths, which, as Luther acknowledges, they could not have received except from tradition.—Whence do they learn that the old and new Testaments are inspired?—From tradition.—Who taught them that a multitude of texts of Scripture are to be understood in a sense quite opposed to their literal meaning? for instance, that Sunday is to be set apart for the worship of God, and not the Sabbath; that receiving the Eucharist is not absolutely necessary for the salvation of infants, notwithstanding those words of our Saviour: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man . . . you shall not have life in you;" that baptism conferred on infants even by heretics is valid, although Jesus Christ has associated baptism and faith as inseparable means of salvation: "He that be-

[1] Sine traditionibus non scriptis Evangelium purum nomen.

[2] See Becan. *Manuale Controv. de trad.*, ii. n. 32 et seq.

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved;" that the washing of feet is not obligatory, in spite of that formal precept: "You also ought to wash one another's feet;"[1] and that terrible sanction, "If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me." Who has told them that the command to abstain from eating blood and things strangled, which was published by the Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem,[2] no longer affects us?—Tradition. The Protestants called Episcopalians, regard episcopacy as a divine institution, and by divine right superior to the priestly order:—from what source have they derived this doctrine. From tradition. In reality it is tradition alone which has given Protestants all they yet possess of Christianity. They cannot then reject this same tradition without placing themselves in flagrant contradiction with themselves.

4. Moreover, Scripture, to which they wish to confine themselves, condemns them, for Scripture itself establishes the authority of tradition. "There are also," says St. John, at the end of his gospel, "many other things which Jesus did; which if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written."[3] This is saying clearly enough that Jesus Christ did not command them to write everything, that to write everything was an impossibility, and that in short *tradition* exists, unless it is maintained that the greater part of the teachings of our Divine Saviour are entirely lost.

St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says to them: "I praise you, brethren, that you keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you,"[4] unquestionably by word of mouth.—And to the Thessalonians: "Hold the traditions

[1] Joan. xiii, 15. [2] Act. xv, 9

[3] Sunt alia multa quœ fecit Jesus; quæ si scribantur per singula, nec ipsum arbitror mundum capere posse eos qui scribendi sunt libros. *Joan.* xxi, 25.

[4] Laudo vos quod . . . . . sicut tradidi vobis præcepta mea tenetis. I *Cor.* xi, 2.

which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle."[1]—And to Timothy: "And the things which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commend (entrust) to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also."[2]—"Having more things to write unto you, I would not by paper and ink; for I hope that I shall be with you, and speak face to face,"[3] &c.

5. In fine, all the eminent teachers that Christianity has produced, all the serious thinkers among the Protestants themselves, are opposed to the contempt which the first Reformers affected to have for tradition. Let us confine ourselves to a few very brief quotations.

According to the statement of Eusebius, St. Ignatius exhorted the faithful "to hold firmly to the tradition of the Apostles:" *Apostolorum traditionibus, fortiter inhærerent.*[4] St. Irenœus, in his treatise against Heresies, rests most strongly on tradition. "If any question should arise," he says, "must we not have recourse to the most ancient churches, in which the Apostles lived, and receive from them, what is clear and certain as to the matter in dispute? And what though the Apostles had not left us any writings—would it not have been our duty to follow the rules of the traditions which they delivered to those, to whom they committed the churches? As in fact is done by many barbarous nations, who have salvation written on their hearts by the Spirit, without paper and ink, and carefully preserve the old tradition, believing in one God the Creator, and in Jesus Christ His Son," &c. And in another place: "It is our duty to obey the Priests of the church, who have their succession from the Apostles; who with the succession of the Episcopate have received the same gift of truth." (*Charisma, veritatis certium.*[5])

[1] Tenete traditiones quas didicistis sive per sermonem, sive per epistolam nostram. II *Thessal.* ii, 14.

[2] II Tim. II, 2.

[3] II Joan. I, 12.

[4] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c 36.

[5] *Adv. Hæres.*, l. iii. c. 4. et. l. iv, c. 43

"That alone must we believe to be the truth," says Origen, "which differs in nothing from the ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition."[1] And in another place: "The Church has received a tradition from the Apostles to give baptism even to children."[2]

St. Cyprian teaches that in every doubtful question we ought to revert to the tradition of the Apostles.[3] The principle of the Pope St. Stephen, which he admitted, was: *Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est.*

St. Basil thus speaks: "Of the doctrines preserved in the Church, we hold some from the written teaching; others transmitted to us from the tradition of the Apostles, we have received, as it were, in secret; both have the same force (or value) in regard to religion."[4]

"Tradition, as well as Scripture, belongs to the completeness of Christian Truth," says Tertullian;—and in another place: "If you are a Christian, believe what has been handed down." *Si Christianus es, crede quod traditum est.*[5]

St. John Chrysostom: "The Apostles did not deliver everything by Epistles; but much without writing: and both the one and the other are alike trustworthy. Let us therefore account the tradition of the Church worthy of faith. It is a tradition—ask no more.[6]

St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, St. Augustin,[7] express themselves in the same way. St. Vincent of Lerins who lived at the end of the fifth century, shows in the following words, not only the authority of tradition, but also the necessity of such an authority for the interpretation of Scripture: "Some one may ask, what need is there of the authority of the Church's teaching, since Scripture is per-

[1] *De principiis*, lib. i. n, 2. [2] *In Epist. ad Rom.* l. v. n. 9.
[3] Epist. lxiii. [4] *De Spirit. Sancto.* xxvii.
[5] *De Præscr.* xix. *De Corona, Mil.* c. iv. *De Carn, Christi.* c. ii.
[6] *Hom.* iv, *in Epist.* ii, *ad Thess.* n. 2.
[7] St. Athanas. *Epist. ad Præs. Africæ.* St. Jerome, *In Isaiam.* c. ix. *In Ezechiel*, c. xlviii. *In Amos*, c. ix. St. Augustine, *De civit. Dei.* l. xv. c. 23.

fect, of itself sufficient, and more than sufficient for everything? We reply, that owing to the very depth of Scripture it is not understood by all in the same sense; one man interprets it in one way, another in another, so that one might suppose that as many meanings might be drawn from it as there are readers. Novatian explains it in one manner, Photinus in another, Arius, &c., in another. This is the reason why on account of the many varieties given, the line of interpretation must be drawn according to the standard of the ecclesiastical and Catholic sense .... It never was, it nowhere is, it never will be allowable for Catholic christians to teach any other doctrine than that which they have received, and it always has been, everywhere is, and will be their duty to anathematize those who do otherwise ..... But do the heretics allege testimonies from the Scriptures? Assuredly they do, and with the greatest confidence. You will see them run lightly over the different books, those of Moses, of Kings, the Psalms, the Gospels, &c... At home or in public, in their discourses or their writings, nay, in convivial meetings or in the streets, they scarcely bring forward any of their views without Scriptural expressions .... But the more they hide themselves under the shade of Scripture, the more are they to be feared ... Let us remember that Satan transforms himself into an Angel of light ... He who assailed the Lord of glory Himself with quotations from the Scriptures, what will he not do to us poor mortals? ... If then the devil and his disciples, the heretics, can thus pervert the divine words, what shall Catholics, the children of our mother, the Church, do, to distinguish truth from falsehood? They shall take great care to observe the rule, which holy and learned men have delivered to us, as we said at the beginning of this Treatise, and interpret the divine Scripture according to the traditions of the universal church and the rule of Catholic doctrine."[1]

[1] *Commonit. adv. Hæreses.*

To these testimonies let us add the avowals of some Protestants. "Before all things," Grotius said, "it must be supposed that whatever has been generally adopted, without its origin being discoverable, comes from the Apostles." This is precisely the method of St. Vincent of Lerins.[1]

"Without tradition," says Collier, "we could not prove that the old, any more than the new Testament contains the word of God."[2]

"Tradition, not Scripture," Lessing says, "is the rock on which the Church of Jesus Christ is built."[3] And in another place: "The whole of antiquity testifies in favor of tradition, with a united voice, which our Reformers too much disregarded. They ought to have accorded to tradition, as at least it is understood by St. Irenæus, the same divine authority which they thought fit to attribute exclusively to Scripture." And in another passage, anticipating a common objection: "If tradition may have been corrupted, may not the holy books have been falsified?"

Beveridge and Griesback are of the same opinion as Grotius and Lessing.

"Tradition is indispensable for the interpretation of Scripture," said Chemnitz. "And to prove the authenticity of the sacred books," said Augusti. "If the Church had not learned from the lips of the Apostles, that the writings of Mark and Luke were divine, they would not have been received," said Michaelis.

As it is incontestible that the Apostles who wrote nothing, were equal in sanctity to those who published gospels and epistles; Schèrer, for whom inspiration is measured by sanctity, ought to allow to tradition that small portion of authority which he still preserves for Scripture.

[1] *Votum pro pace*, 137.

[2] Hœnighaus, *la Reforme contra la Reforme*, ch. v. [3] Ibid.

III.

Sources of Tradition.—How to distinguish divine and Apostolic Traditions from those which are not such.

Let us beware then of supposing that Jesus Christ, on ascending into heaven, and the Holy Spirit, who had come down on the Apostles, abandoned the Church so soon, leaving nothing on earth to supply their place but a silent, unarmed, dead letter, incapable of promulgating, of explaining, of defending itself, and yet in such wise identified with Christianity, that if that letter should happen to be destroyed, the religion itself would at once be struck dead.

Oh, no! The Word made flesh did much better than that. He left His Revelation *living*, in the authority, in the institutions, in the liturgy of His Church; living in the unanimous consent of Fathers and Doctors, in the decrees of Sovereign Pontiffs and General Councils, in the acts of the Martyrs, in the public and solemn administration of the Sacraments; living in the history, in the faith, the prayers, the religious practices of the Christian family.

You unroll those few leaves of parchment, which the Church places in your hands; there you read some of the truths which she teaches; and assuredly it is well: but should that parchment become illegible, should it be lost, should it be worm-eaten—all antiquity, all the monuments of Christianity, the very stones themselves would cry out aloud, to proclaim those same truths and many others that explain and complete them: Etiamsi tacuerint hi, lapides clamabunt.[1]

Behold those magnificent cathedrals which rise up towards heaven out of every country of Europe, bearing above the clouds the trumpet voice of prayer and the blessed sign of our Redemption: the precept of prayer, the dogma of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic Sacri-

[1] Luc. xix. 40.

fice; the distinction of clergy and people, of the preeminence of bishops over simple priests, &c., all these *data* of Revelation are found there clothed in the most majestic forms of the Romanesque and Gothic styles. You read over again the whole Bible on the richly colored glass. You pass in review the most celebrated characters of ecclesiastical history in contemplating the Duomo of Milan alone.

Go down into the Catacombs! There too you will discover altars for the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; the bones of Martyrs under the stone upon which Jesus Christ was offered; tribunals of penitence where the faithful of the primitive Church went to purify their souls before approaching the sacred feast; sculptures representing the Crucified Saviour, His Virgin Mother, His holy Apostles. There you have Revelation, built, written, engraved even in the very bowels of Rome.

Dig into the bosom of the earth; there you will find medals, inscriptions, epitaphs, urns, lamps, etc. . . These monuments, studied with attention, attest the Primacy of St. Peter, the belief in Purgatory, the invocation of saints, the practice of baptizing infants, a practice as old as the Church, &c., &c. It is Revelation cast in bronze, inlaid in stone and in marble.

Oblige our Libraries to produce their documents; you can there examine, as witnesses to the belief of their time, the Greek and Latin Fathers, the theologians, the preachers, the controversial writers of every country and of every century; nay, the heretics themselves, who, by their very protests, show us what was the old and generally received belief of their day, which they repudiated . . . It is Revelation speaking all languages, as in the Upper Chamber on the day of Pentecost, and expressing itself by as many voices as the church has friends, or foes, apologists or opponents.

Question the religious usages universally and perpetually observed by the children of the Church; what, for

instance, does the use of the sign of the cross tell you, so frequent, even in the time of Tertullian, the practice of fasting in Lent, of praying for the dead, of repeating the Apostles' Creed?

You ask: But how are truly divine and apostolic traditions to be distinguished from those which are not such? —I answer: How did the Church distinguish the canonical and inspired books from the apocryphal ones? . . . How does the true church make herself distinguished from all the sects? . . Are the perpetuity, the universality, the apostolic origin of a belief or of a practice, in which faith or morals are involved, characters or facts which a church assisted by the presence of the Holy Spirit is unable to discern? In the centuries next after the times of the Apostles, was it not easy for the church to distinguish the Apostolic tradition from every false tradition? And in proportion as we are removed from that first age, must not *traditions truly divine, affecting faith and morals, that have been preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic church*, such as the Council admits—must they not be capable of easy recognition from the profound impression they cannot but have left on minds, manners, and institutions?

One word more on this subject: To admit the authority of tradition, frankly and completely, is to admit that of the Church herself, it is to be a Catholic,—for all the voices of tradition proclaim the authority of the Church.

A few years ago, a party of members of the University of Oxford, with Pusey and Newman at their head, and Manning, Ward, Oakely, Faber, among their followers, declared themselves openly in favor of tradition; not only did they admire it in theory, but they conformed in practice to the ancient usages of the Catholic Church. We saw them erect temples on the plan of our ancient Gothic Churches, set up the old stone altar, light tapers during the celebration of the office, pray at the altar turning to the East, resume the use of the priestly vestments which

had been abandoned for centuries. It was remarked most especially that they fasted, that they practised mortifications, that they invoked the Virgin Mother, that they studied the Fathers, that they testified great respect for the name of Jesus.

The Methodists and Puritans shuddered at the sight. The Established Church seemed to be mended: they endeavored to arrest the movement, they did but hasten the hour of return. The most distinguished members of the original Puseyite party are now Catholics. Several of them have been admitted to the Priesthood. Manning has been made archbishop of Westminster. Newman has established in England the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and by his eloquent discourses, which were heard with enthusiasm by the most learned Anglicans, is preparing the conversion not merely of some of his countrymen, but of England itself, so long called the Isle of Saints. Faber, after writing so many volumes full of learning and piety has died as a saint. The number of Catholics is enormously increased by conversion during the last ten years. The priests and churches have increased by one half; and the religious communities of men and women have doubled. Those who, like Pusey and his adherents, repudiate the views of the so-called Reformers, at the same time that they still continue in the Anglican communion though bound to it by ever weakening ties, are approaching more and more to our belief and practices. They stand at the door of the church, leading others to enter it, and give us hopes that in their turn they will enter it themselves. This movement has changed the character of the religion of England, and communicated itself to the United States, to Germany, to Switzerland . . . It is respect for tradition, which has led Hurter to return to the bosom of the Church, which has made us so long hope for the return of Vinet. May this happy tendency become every day more decided, extend more widely, and at last issue in the desired

result! The day on which our seperated brethren shall be led back by the hand of tradition into the arms of the Church, will be the brightest day which has risen on the world for three centuries.

These preliminary considerations will have removed all the difficulties which the decree of the Council on Scripture and tradition might have offered: we have now only to read it without any preamble.

IV.

FOURTH SESSION.

HELD APRIL 8, 1546.

Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures.

The sacred and holy, œcumenical, and general Synod of Trent, —lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein,—keeping this always in view, that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the Gospel be preserved in the Church; which (Gospel), before promised through the prophets in the holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline;[1] and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety, and reverence,[2] all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession. And It has thought it meet that a list of the sacred books be inserted in this decree, lest a doubt may arise in any one's mind, which are the books that are received by this Synod. They are as set down here

[1] Tamquam fontem omnis, et salutaris veritatis, et morum disciplinæ.
[2] Pari pietatis affectu (sentiment), ac reverentia

below: of the Old Testament: the five books of Moses, to wit, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, the first book of Esdras, and the second which is entitled Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical Psalter,[1] consisting of a hundred and fifty psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch; Ezechiel, Daniel; the twelve minor prophets, to wit, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggœus, Zacharias, Malachias; two books of the Machabees; the first and the second. Of the New Testament: the four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke the Evangelist; fourteen epistles of Paul the Apostle, (one) to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, (one) to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, (one) to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter the Apostle, three of John the Apostle, one of the Apostle James, one of Jude the Apostle, and the Apocalypse of John the Apostle. But if any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been usually read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately contemn the traditions aforesaid; let him be anathema. Let all, therefore, understand, in what order, and in what manner, the said Synod, after having laid the foundation of the Confession of faith, will proceed, and what testimonies and authorities[2] it will mainly use in confirming dogmas, and in restoring morals in the Church.

[1] Psalterium Davidicum, the Psalter called David's.
[2] Præsidiis.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

On the Holy Trinity.

Convinced that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ, we receive her Baptism. It is conferred on us "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—From her we learn to make on ourselves the sign of the Christian: it is accompanied by these words, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." We conclude all our hymns and canticles with that consecrated chant, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;" and we offer all our prayers to the Father "through Jesus Christ, His Son, who lives and reigns with Him, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever."

I.

Ideas respecting the Holy Trinity supplied by the Creed of the Catholic Church.

The Apostles' Creed, which it is necessary to have learned and repeated before receiving Baptism, teaches us to believe in God; "Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

The first Council of Antioch, assembled by order of St. Dionysius, (in 266) to condemn the errors of Paul of Samosata, proves by the Scriptures that the Son of God is before all things, that He is the Word, that He has been made flesh, and that if He is called consubstantial with the Father, it is not in the erroneous sense attributed to the word by Paul, who supposed the existence of three similar substances in the Trinity, but in the sense that He is of one and the same necessary and self-existing sub-

stance as the Father.[1] The Council of Nice (in 325) anathematizes those who say that the Son of God is a creature. It is right, says the first Council of Rome, under Julius I. (in 337) to cut off from the Catholic Church those who separate the Word, His Son, from the substance and Godhead of the Father.

The symbol called of St. Athanasius, which the Church has inserted in her liturgy, of which a Council at Autun (in 670) declared that it ought to be, with the Apostles' creed, the rule of faith of all the clergy, and which (in 848) Hincmar of Rheims directed all the faithful to learn by heart—developes the doctrine of the Trinity in these words:

"The Catholic faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also they are not three uncreateds, nor three incomprehensibles; but one uncreated and one incomprehensible. In like manner the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Ghost almighty. And yet they are not three almighties, but one almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord. And yet they are not three Lords, but one Lord. For as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge each Per-

[1] Doct. et discipl. Eccles. Auct. L. du Mesnil, l. vii, p. 387.

son by Himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidder by the Catholic religion to say there are three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of none, neither created, nor begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is from the Father and the Son, not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity there is nothing before or after, nothing greater or less; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal.[1] So that in all things, as it hath been already said, the Unity is to be worshipped in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity. He, therefore, that would be saved must thus think of the Trinity."

The doctrine of the Church on this great mystery, may be thus briefly stated.

There is but one only God, whose nature is one, simple, indivisible.

This divine Nature subsists in three distinct Persons; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

These three Persons are perfectly equal, and are alike in all things, except that the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, and the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Although the operations which are performed extrinsically to the Trinity itself are common to the three Persons, still it is neither the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son only that is incarnate.

[1] "Firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur," says the Fourth Lateran Council, under Innocent III. (in 1215), "quod unus solus est verus Deus, æternus et immensus, omnipotens, incommutabilis, incomprehensibilis et ineffabilis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus;—Tres quidem personæ sed una essentia, substantia seu natura simplex omnino. Pater a nullo, Filius autem a solo Patre, ac Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque pariter absque initio semper et fine. Pater generans, Filius nascens, et Spiritus sanctus procedens; consubstantiales et co-æquales, co-omnipotentes et co-æterni, unum universorum Principium."

Finally, the three Persons, though really distinct from each other, are *consubstantial*, that is to say, one only and identical Divine nature or substance subsists in the Three.

II.

Proofs of this Mystery found in Scripture.

It is easy for the Church to show that Scripture and tradition justify the faith which she enjoins on us in the mystery of the Trinity.

We have only to open any book of the New Testament, to see there, taught on every page, the absolute, perfect, indivisible unity of the nature of God, "O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God:"[1] and at the same time, that contrast as to origination, that distinction, so marked and so decisive, of names and missions, that attributing of different operations which implies the Trinity of these Divine Persons, whom we call the Father, the Son or Word, and the Holy Ghost.

The Father begets the Son. By Him He created the universe, and by Him He speaks to us in Jesus Christ;[2] He sends Him to save the world;[3] He proclaims Him as His beloved Son in whom He is well pleased;[4] He makes Him the victim of propitiation for sin;[5] He appoints Him judge of the living and the dead;[6] He makes Him sit at His own right hand;[7] He abides in Him and works in Him;[8] He glorifies Him;[9] He gives testimony to Him;[10] from Him proceeds the Holy Spirit,[11] whom He sends in the name of the Son.[12]

The Son is begotten;[13] He is the only[14] and the beloved

[1] Matth. xii, 29. Joan. viii, 41. Act. xvii, 24. Rom. iii, 30. Gal. iii. 20. Eph. iv, 5, 6. 1 Tim. ii, 5. Jacob. ii, 19.
[2] Hebr. I. 2, 5. [3] Joan. iii, 17. [4] Matth. xvii, 5.
[5] Misit filium suum propitiationem pro peccatis nostris.
[6] Joan. v. 22. [7] Hebr. i. 13. [8] Joan. xvi. 10.
[9] Joan. xii. 28. [10] Joan. viii. 18. [11] Joan. xv. 26.
[12] Joan. xiv. 26 [13] Joan. i. 14, 18. [1] Joan. i. 15.

Son;[1] He is called the Word;[2] He is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the figure of His substance;[3] the image of the invisible God;[4] He is made flesh;[5] He becomes our surety, and our advocate with the Father.[6] No one cometh to the Father but by Him.[7] He sends us the Holy Spirit who receives (or proceeds) from Him, &c.[8]

The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father,[9] and receives from the Son;[10] He teaches all truth,[11] He reveals things to come;[12] He speaks by the mouth of the confessors of the faith;[13] He searches the depths of God;[14] He distributes His gifts as He will;[15] He testifies that Christ is the truth;[16] a blasphemous word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost will never be forgiven;[17] He is called the Paraclete, etc., etc.

The Evangelists all relate that at the moment when Jesus was baptized, the heavens were opened, and the Spirit of God, in bodily form like a dove, descended upon Him; and a voice was heard from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[18] In this glorious and striking manifestation of God, the three Divine Persons are perfectly delineated.

They are seen to be perfectly distinct in that promise of the Saviour: "When *the Paraclete* cometh, whom *I* will send you *from the Father*, the *Spirit of truth*, who proceedeth *from the Father*, He shall give testimony of *me*."[19] And in those words of St. John: "In this we know that we abide in Him, and He in us; because He hath given us of *His Spirit;* and we have seen and do testify, that *the Father* hath sent *His Son* to be the Saviour of the world."[20]

[1] Mark i. 11. [2] Joan. i. 1, etc. [3] Hebr. i. 3.
[4] Colos. i. 15. [5] Joan. i. 14. [6] 1 Joan. ii. 1.
[7] Joan. xiv. 6. [8] Joan. xv. 26. [9] Joan. xv. 26.
[10] Joan. xvi. 14. [11] Joan. xvi. 13. [12] Joan. xvi. 13.
[13] Matth. x. 20. [14] 1 Cor. ii. 10. [15] 1 Cor. xii. 11.
[16] 1 Joan. v. 6. [17] Matth. xii. 32.
[18] Joan, i. 32; Matth. iii. 16, 17; Mark i. 10; Luc. iii. 32.
[19] Joan. xv. 26. [20] 1 Joan. iv. 13.

The first epistle of the beloved disciple puts this truth continually before us, under every form; and concludes thus: "It is the Spirit, which testifieth that Christ is the truth. And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost;"[1]—and just as Jesus Christ had said; "I and the Father are one;"[2] *Ego et Pater unum sumus;* so St. John concludes—"and these three" (Persons) "are one," (one only and the same being:) *Et hi tres unum sunt.*

St. Peter addresses his first Epistle to those who are "elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, unto sanctification of the Spirit, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

The Saviour of mankind could therefore give His Apostles the injunction to "baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:"[3] and till the last day of the world this formula will testify among all people that the grace of regeneration, which makes us children of one great and only God, is conferred upon us *in the name*, that is to say, by the power and the invocation, one and undivided, of the divine Persons, *the Father*, *the Son*, *and the Holy Ghost.*

This explicit teaching of the New Testament assists us to understand a number of passages in the Old, in which remarkable indications of the doctrine of the Trinity occur.

In Genesis, God often speaks of Himself in the plural number; an unusual and mysterious form of expression, which cannot be explained by the laws of the Hebrew language. "Let us make man to our image."[4] . . "Be-

[1] 1 Joan. v. 7. On the genuineness of this verse, the reader may consult the triumphant demonstrations of the late Cardinal Wiseman, (two letters published at Rome in 1835, republished in Vol. 1, of *Essays on various subjects*, London, 1853,) and of Perrone (*De Trinit.* c. 11). This verse is so necessary to the context that the passage is inexplicable without it.

[2] Joan. x. 30. [3] Matth. xxviii. 19. [4] Genes. i. 26.

hold Adam is become one of us."[1] . . . "Come let us go down and confound their tongue."[2] . . "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"[3] . . The Lord appeared to Abraham under the form of three persons, in whom he recognized but one God. "Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight, pass not away from thy servant."[4] Farther on, it is said that "the Lord rained upon Sodom fire from the Lord out of heaven."[5] In the Psalms this distinction appears more than once. "The Lord said to my Lord; Sit thou at my right hand."[6] "The Lord hath said to me; thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."[7] "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts,"[8] was the cry of the Seraphim;[8] and the ancient Rabbis commented thus on the angelic word, "Holy is the Father, holy is the Son, holy is the Holy "Spirit." The books of Solomon speak of wisdom as *conceived* before all creation, as *brought forth* before the mountains had been established; in terms which remind us of the magnificent opening of the Gospel of St. John.[9]

III.

Proofs supplied by tradition.

From the very earliest ages, the faith of the Church in the dogma of the Trinity has been expressed, both by the form of Baptism,— ("We are immersed not once only but thrice," says Tertullian, "at each name"[10])—and by the invocation which accompanies not Baptism only, but even the Sign of the Cross, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;"—as also by the hymn of "glory be to the Father and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," or, "to the Father by the Son in the

[1] Genes. iii. 22. [2] Genes. xi. 7. [3] Isai. vi. 8.
[4] Genes. xviii. 2. [5] Genes. xix. 24. [6] Ps. cix. 1.
[7] Ps. ii. 7. [8] Is. vi. 3. [9] Parab. viii, ix.
[10] Nec semel sed ter, ad singula nomina, in singulas personas tingimur (*Adv. Praxeam.* c. xxvi).

Holy Ghost,"[1] and by the creeds, which under different forms contain the pure and simple enunciation of belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. The words Τριας among the Greeks, and *Trinitas* among the Latins, has from the beginning been consecrated as the name of this mystery.

In the acts of the martyrdom of St. Andrew, which perhaps do not belong to the first century, but are certainly of very high antiquity, we read: "Peace be with you, and with all those who believe in one God, perfect in Trinity, the true Father who begot, the true Son only begotten, the true Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and abiding in the Son."

"Have we not one God; one Christ, and one Spirit of grace that has been poured out upon us?" says St. Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians.[2]

"Earnestly endeavor," St. Ignatius the martyr wrote to the Magnesians, "to be confirmed in the doctrines of the Lord and the Apostles, that, in all your works, temporal and spiritual, done in faith and charity, you may have good success, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." "Be subject to the Bishop and to each other, as Jesus Christ, according to the flesh, was to the Father, and as the Apostles were to Christ, and to the Father, and to the Holy Spirit."[3]

Just before his martyrdom, St. Polycarp cried out to God: "I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee by Jesus Christ, the everlasting High Priest, Thy only Son; by Him and with Him in the Holy Spirit, be glory unto Thee now and for ever and ever."[4] And St. Epipodius, martyred at Lyons, in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, died repeating: "I confess that Jesus Christ is God with the Father and the Holy Ghost."[5]

St. Justin, in his Apology for Christianity, wrote:

[1] St. Justin. *Apol.* i. n. 65. *Can. Apost.* xxxiv. *Const.* Apost. viii.
[2] 1 Cor. xlvi. [3] Ad Magn. xiii. Ad Eph. ix.
[4] Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 14. [5] *Act. Martyr. Lugd.*

"We worship and adore the Father, and the Son who came from Him, and the Holy Spirit who inspired the Prophets."[1]

Some of the heathens called the Christians *atheists*, because they despised the idols; Athenogoras replied: "Who would not be astonished to hear us called atheists, when we acknowledge that there is a God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy Spirit united in power and distinct in order?"[2] St. Dionysius, cited by St. Basil, affirms that he had received from the Elders, who lived before him, the form and rule of ascribing glory "to God the Father, and to the Son with the Holy Ghost."[3] Tertullian, in his treatise against Praxeas, establishes both the Trinity of Persons and the unity of the Divine Substance. St. Basil[4] shows that this belief in the Trinity is the faith of all Christian antiquity; that it is necessary to salvation; that it is in the name of the Trinity that Baptism is conferred, sins remitted, &c. St. Augustine proves this doctrine by the Scriptures, and seeks to bring it home to the mind by several illustrations to which we shall presently have occasion to revert.[5]

Meanwhile as soon as an innovator arises, attacking either the distinction of Persons or the Divinity of any one of them, he is condemned by the Church. Thus in the very first century, the Ebionites and the disciples of Cerinthus, are struck by all the anathemas of St. John, for denying the divinity of the Son, as Arius was at a later period. Simon Magus, Praxeas, Noëtus, Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata, are in their turn condemned and cast out for having rejected the distinction of the Divine Persons.

The appearance of these heresies gives rise to successive definitions of faith, which are continually more and more

[1] *Apol.* i. n. 6.
[2] *Leg. pro. Christ.* x.
[3] De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxix. n. 72.
[4] De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxix. n. 72, and Epist. viii.
[5] *De Trinitate* passim; and De Civit. Dei. l. xi. c. 26, at the words: Et sumus, et nos esse novimus et id esse ac nosse dil gimus.

clear and explicit. We have heard that of the Council of Nice. The first Council of Constantinople, to brand the error of Macedonius, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, adds these words to the formula of Nice: "We believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who together with the Father and the Son is to be adored and glorified." The fourth Council of Constantinople:[1] "We believe in one God, in three consubstantial Persons," . . . we declare that God is one and singular in substance and three in Persons." The fourth Council of Lateran expresses itself thus: "We believe firmly, and sincerely confess, that there is one only true God, eternal, immense, almighty, unchangeable, incomprehensible, and ineffable, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost . . . Three persons indeed, but one absolutely simple essence, substance or nature."[2] As at the time of their schism, the Greeks made much use of passages of Scripture and of Councils in which it is said that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, as a reason for denying that He proceeeded from the Son, the second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence repeat, after the first Council of Lateran, that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from the Son; and the Council of Trent approves the addition of *Filioque* made to the creed of Constantinople.

These testimonies sufficiently establish the Catholic tradition. Indeed, most of the Unitarians and other opponents of the doctrine of the Trinity agree, that the faith of the Church in this mystery has been fixed since the first Council of Nice. The dogma then is firmly established. When we have accepted it with submission, we may meditate upon it, with profit both to our minds and our hearts. Without departing from the plan, which we have traced for ourselves, we may devote a few minutes to this subject.

[1] Act. x.

[2] C. 1. (The Latin has been cited in a note in section 1, commencing "Firmiter credimus," etc.)

IV.

Reflections on the mystery of the Trinity.

We begin to have a true idea of God," says St. Augustine, "when we perceive that He is incomprehensible."[1] No sentiment could be more just, and every elevated mind must subscribe to this reflection of a great genius. How, in fact, is the infinite Being, the Eternal, the Immense, to be comprehended by a mortal mind, which is so narrow, so limited, accustomed to see everywhere, in itself and all around it, succession, composition, imperfection! How are we to reconcile with each other all those perfections which essentially belong to the absolute and necessary Being? He is unchangeable and He is free; creator and infinite; simple and inconceivable; immense and present in every place; one and fruitful; eternal and the author of time; incorporeal and the creator of bodies; the author of man's freedom, and in no wise the author of evil; &c., &c. What intelligence could presume to flatter itself that it could comprehend the nature and the harmony of all these attributes, which it conceives as necessarily existing in God, but the reconciling of which appears so difficult?

But what then! do we understand ourselves? can we say what is the substance of our soul or of our body? or what the link is which unites them to each other? Have we any conception how our immaterial soul acts on matter? Have we discovered the origin of our ideas? the secret of our generation? Can we say whether our body is infinitely divisible or is resolvable into simple elements? When our own nature is thus full of mysteries, for us, it necessarily follows that the essence of the Infinite Being should present mysteries analogous to these, and yet more profound. If then the Eternal, for reasons worthy of His wisdom and of His love, wills to make known to us the

[1] Vere aliquid de Deo cognoscimus cum ipsum comprehendere non possumus.

innermost secret of His Nature, He cannot but place before us a mystery; and the most legitimate argument in favor of a dogma which reveals to us the inner nature of God, will be its very obscurity. "It is only at the sight of the sun that our eyes are dazzled."

But this revelation, mysterious though it be, cannot be useless. In accepting it with confidence, and out of respect for the authority of God, which is manifestly exercised upon us, our understanding submits, it stays its curious enquiries at the foot of God's throne, it casts down its eyes in reverence before the Infinite Majesty, it assumes in the presence of the Most High an attitude full of veneration, and makes an act of docility, of self distrust, of confidence in the Author of its being. It is silent, and it adores; repeating the words of the Prophet: "Let my silence praise thee, O Lord! *Tibi silentium laus, Domine!*

Thus to lead every understanding to bend under the yoke of faith, and meriting by that act of submission and obedience the clear and unveiled vision of the face of God, is evidently one of the motives which have led the Almighty to communicate to us the knowledge of His Name. Yes, He who brought the universe into existence out of nothing, who restored life to sinners by His own death, who chose a few unlettered fishermen to be the teachers of the world, who built up His whole code of morals on this maxim: "Blessed are the poor"—was consistent in inscribing the doctrine of the Trinity at the beginning of the Apostolic Creed, and only bestowing His Baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. By this means the authority of the Supreme Intelligence makes itself felt by our intelligence; the Saviour who knows and who wishes to cure our presumption, our arrogance, our want of docility, refuses to admit into His school any but honest, straightforward and tractable minds, who, at their very first lesson, are content to sacrifice their pride, and their restless curiosity

to the authority of His word: *Amen! Amen!* It could not be otherwise. The Lord had acted in the same way towards Moses: before revealing to him His Name and giving him a sublime mission, He bade him keep at a distance from the burning bush, and not tread that holy ground save reverently and with bare feet: and in fact, at the sight of God the first movement of His servant was to hide his face; "for he durst not look at God." [1]

Our submission is very quickly and very abundantly recompensed. Faith in the Trinity at the very outset secures us from all the errors, necessarily fatal errors, which have obscured the right idea of the true God, to the eyes of man. We will only speak of three, and they are the most monstrous of these errors,—Atheism, Polytheism, Pantheism.

Atheism lies at the bottom of every erroneous idea put forth respecting the Godhead; for to deny any one of the attributes of God, or to ascribe to Him the slightest imperfection, is to lay down a principle which involves as a logical consequence the negation of God Himself. Atheism denies the life, the personal and individual subsistence of God. In the view of the Atheist, God is at most an idea, an abstraction, a creation of the reason or fancy. This fearful system is thrice refuted, thrice reduced to nothing by that utterance of the Word, which shows us the God of the universe thrice living, thrice subsisting; subsisting and living as Creator, subsisting and living as Saviour, subsisting and living as Sanctifier, and therefore having a threefold right to call Himself the living God, in whom three can say, I am who am: *Ego sum qui sum. Vivo Ego, dicit Dominus.*[2]

[1] Ne appropies huc; solve calceamentum de pedibus tuis; locus enim in quo stas terra sancta est. . . Et abscondit Moyses faciem suam; non enim audebat aspicere contra Deum. *Exod.* iii. 5.

[2] It is thus that St. Justin and Athenagoras, in their Apologies, exculpate themselves from the charge of Atheism with which the heathens reproached them, by alleging their belief in the divine Trinity. (St. Just. *Apol.* i. 6; Athenag. *Leg.* c. 10. cited above.

Polytheism had made this world a Pandemonium, wherein all was God, except God Himself. All those idols consecrated by human passions, had one common foundation in the blinded reason of mankind: the necessity that God should reproduce Himself, so far as this is possible for the Infinite Being, that He should be active and fruitful from all eternity, and happy in society worthy of Him, as also the need for man to see the Deity draw near to His creatures and provide for all their minutest wants. The doctrine of the Trinity satisfies, and it alone can worthily satisfy, all these exigencies. It shows us in Heaven a God having fecundity, a God who in a certain sense reproduces Himself, and by this mysterious fruitfulness acquires society which constitutes His blessedness; a God who, condescending to enter into the most intimate relations with us, is for us *Father*, *Word* or Utterance expressed and understood, *Holy and Sanctifying Spirit*, diffusing Himself in our hearts to become there the principle of a supernatural life. But Polytheism forgot that the Infinite is necessarily one, and that He could not reproduce Himself to the prejudice of the perfect and absolute unity which is essential to Him. The Christian dogma reconciles the unity and the simplicity that are inseparable from the infinite Nature, with the divine fecundity, with the intimate and blessed society of the Divine Persons. Thus we adore a *Son of God*, but at the same time anathematize the thought of any Son of God, who is not one God with His Father: we adore a Divine Spirit, emanating from God and Himself God, while we repudiate as non-existent all those genii, pretended gods, who are not one God with the principle from which they emanate. Polytheism by multiplying the Divine Nature annihilated it. Christianity, by proclaiming the Unity of Essence and the Trinity of Persons, brings together in God, and associates marvellously in His bosom, all that is required by the infinity of His Being;

activity, fecundity, society, enjoyment, happiness, and, above all, perfect simplicity and indivisible unity.

Of all the aberrations of the human mind, Pantheism is the most subtle in its principles, the most monstrous in its consequences. This erroneous manner of considering the infinite and necessary Being tends to identify with Him all that has been, all that is, all that is to be, even the thought of all crimes, the execution of all transgressions. In this point of view, all that we call created, and we ourselves even, are, with Him, who was formerly called Creator and Lord, only the one single and absolute substance, moving, expanding as a flower, reproducing itself. In vain does conscience revolt, and common sense protest, and reason shudder; this hideous system,—which creates chaos in metaphysics, atheism in religion, the most unbridled license in morals, the most complete anarchy in politics,—goes on deducing its consequences, turning the world upside down, and bringing back a state of barbarism into the very heart of civilized society. What do we need in order to oppose an irresistible and impassable barrier to this overwhelming torrent? A distinction, as simple as it is fruitful of consequences, supplied by the doctrine of the Trinity, understood in the the Christian sense. This mystery teaches us carefully to distinguish the essential, necessary, interior acts, which, in a mysterious manner, produce or reproduce the infinite in Unity, from those free operations of which the term can only be contingent, external, finite. Yes, God acts necessarily within Himself; He knows Himself; He loves Himself. These essential acts, the subject of which is God, and of which God is also the object, although essentially different in form—as different as our understanding and our will—terminate in the bosom of the infinite Nature, which is necessarily one and indivisible in three distinct and yet *consubstantial Persons;* so that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, while differing in their origination, are one only and the same God. Thus the

principle and fruit of the divine generation and spiration are alike true God; and it is here, in the mysterious operations of the Trinity, that the one only and absolute substance reigns and exercises sovereign power; here all is God, here the most complete Pantheism finds its place. But, let us say to the Pantheists, is not the infinitely perfect Being free? Is not freedom an attribute of omnipotence? We, who are so proud of our liberty—shall we refuse it to God? If, then, we grant this liberty to Him by whom we ourselves were created free, what shall we assign as an object to the divine free will? Undoubtedly it will no longer be the *actuation* of the necessary Being. The *term* of a free act cannot be necessary; this would involve a contradiction in words. The term then of the divine liberty in action will be a being that is not necessary, not infinite, not God. This being will be or will not be—will be such or such—will be for a little while or without end—according as the free choice or will of God shall have decreed. At the first signal of his desire, it will be called out of non-existence into being, that is to say, *created;* it will be placed in a grade of existence conformable to its origin, not necessary, not infinite, not divine, but suited to it, though always and of necessity dependent on the Creator.[1]

Thus, owing especially to the revelation of the Trinity, we can lay open before ancient and modern pantheists the principle of their errors. We can tell them the name of the one only and absolute substance which actuates itself in unity, and in which the Generating Principle, the Son that is generated, and the Spirit that proceeds from both, are God, still God, and always God, identically and nu-

[1] A definition of faith, drawn up by the Council of Toledo and approved by St. Leo (in 447), says: *Animam autem hominis non divinam esse substantiam aut Dei parem, sed creaturam dicimus, divina voluntate creatam.* And farther on: *Si quis dixerit vel crediderit animam humanam Dei portionem esse, vel Dei esse substantiam, anathema sit!* And again: *Si quis dixerit aut crediderit a Deo omnipotenti mundum hunc factum non fuisse atque ejus omnia instrumenta, anathema sit!*

merically one and the same God;[1] that is *the most Holy and adorable Trinity!* And we can also show them, in the free omnipotence of God, the creative principle which gives actuality to possible existences when He wills it and because He wills it, and thus constitutes a multitude of beings that are—*not God*—but creatures instinctively conscious of their own nothingness, who cannot without sin forget their utter dependency, nor confound themselves with their Author the only God, without impiety as revolting as it is senseless and absurd.

As a first recompense, then, for our teachable faith, God secures our minds from these gross illusions, which so often gain possession of the understanding of pretended philosophers, and throw them into all the aberrations of folly.[2] But the divine goodness does not limit its bounty to this. Our faith procures us a knowledge of God and of His relations to us, ever more and more intelligent, sweet and salutary.

This advantage cannot be sufficiently appreciated. One single step towards a more distinct and elevated knowledge of God is infinitely to be preferred to all human learning and science, to all the treasures of the world. "To know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, is," as our Saviour Himself says, "eternal life."[3]

It is scarcely necessary to remark that there is not a shadow of contradiction in the enunciation of this mystery: one Nature or substance, three Persons. It is true that we know nothing like this in the world, but who is to be compared to God? *Quis ut Deus?* We do, however, know many things that are analogous to it: First, we know that unity of person does not involve unity of substance; witness man, in whom two substances, one spiritual, the other corporeal, constitute a single human person.

[1] Omniaque unum sunt, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio. (*Decret. pro Jacob. unione, in conc. Florent. Labbe.* xiii. 1206.)

[2] Dicentes se esse sapientes stulti facti sunt. *Rom.* i. 22.

[3] Joan. xvii. 3.

Next, we know that the law of the development, or life of the human race, may be expressed in a formula which is not without analogy to that of the Trinity.[1] This is an observation of Hugo de St. Victor. What is necessary for the existence of that moral being which we call humanity; and for its continuing to bring into actual existence and reproduce itself to the end of time? One first person, not originally generated, but generating, called the *father;* a second person, proceeding from the first, and becoming with it one and the same generating principle; which we call the *mother;* and a third person, generated by the two, called the *son.* Astonishing fact! in the life of this poor worm which we call man, we already find paternity and filiation, generation and procession, and the concurrence of two persons becoming the principle of a third; that is to say, most of the elements which enter into the mysterious definition of the Trinity! In humanity, however, such procession and generation multiply the nature, and all these operations involve succession and imperfection and what is coarse and material. Well then, let us raise our thoughts above the objects of sense, and endeavor to ascertain the law according to which our soul lives, that in a special sense is made according *to the image and likeness of God.*[2] Our soul, immaterial and uncompounded, is one. The law of its life is *to have a conception* of itself, and to *love* itself. It has a conception of itself, and this conception of its understanding is fruitful and reproductive, so that the soul becomes present to itself, sees itself, embraces or comprehends (grasps) itself, (prehendit se cum seipsâ); the conceiving principle which we may call the *father* of our thought, bringing before it the fruit of our conception which we may call our *word*, the *son* of our understand-

[1] Est vir principium unde mulier, de quibus procedit tertium, id est proles. *lib.* i. *de Sacramentis.*

[2] Faciamus hom nem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram. *Genes.* i. 26.

ing; the *figure* and *image* of our substance, as is said of the Word in respect of His Father.[1] This first operation which establishes in our spiritual nature, without impairing its unity, a relation analogous to that of the Father and the Son, is followed necessarily by another. The soul wills itself, loves itself, and by an emotion of which breathing is the best image, it makes itself living and happy, giving itself an actual and completed existence with all the powers of its will. Now, between the soul thus loving itself and the soul thus loved, and brought actually and completely to its natural perfection by the activity of this love, there exists the relation of a *principle*, which we may call *breathing*, to a result of which the most suitable name is *life* manifested by the *breath*, *spiritus*.

St. Augustine, Bossuet, Leibnitz and many others have pointed out this analogy.

St. Augustine observes that our soul knows and loves itself necessarily; that if its knowledge were equal to its essence, and its love to its knowledge, it would be perfect; that we must therefore distinguish in the soul the spiritual being which he calls *mens*, and the knowledge which it has of itself, and the love which it has for itself as soon as it knows itself; and that these three things which are distinct, co-existing, equal and consubstantial, for they are but one and the same human soul, are an imperfect image of the adorable Trinity.[2]

Bossuet developes this idea admirably:[3] "I see in myself three distinct things; being, understanding, willing.

"And it is Thy will, O my God! that I should exist forever, for Thou hast given me an immortal soul: and when Thou shalt have made me blessed in Thy presence I shall have in beholding Thee, but one knowledge; in

[1] Figura substantiæ Dei, *Hebr.* i. 3; Imago Dei invisibilis, *Colos.* i. 15.
[2] *De Trinit.*, lib. ix and x.
[3] *Elevations sur les Mystéres* and *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle.* Leibnitz, *Syst. Theol.*, n. 13.

loving Thee, but one will; I shall have but one eternal understanding, but one eternal act of will.

My being, my understanding, my will, will not be less distinct, from each other, because they will then be perfect, invariable, coëternal, nor less identified with my very innermost nature, or with my substance. And my will or my love will always and necessarily proceed from my knowledge of myself; and my knowledge will always be the conception, the expression, the production of my being; thus there will always be in me these three things: the being producing the knowledge, the knowledge produced, and the love produced by the two.

If I was an infinite, necessary nature, incapable of any addition of accident to substance, in whom all was substantial; then my knowledge and my love would be something substantial and subsisting, and I should be three persons subsisting in one substance—that is to say, I should be God.

But as this is not so, I am only made after the image and likeness of God, and am an unfinished sketch of that unique substance which is all at once Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; a substance incomprehensible in its triune Godhead; which is, in reality but one and the same; sovereign, immense, perfectly one in three distinctly subsisting, equal, consubstantial persons, to whom is due but one worship, one adoration, one love."

After these developments, which it would be easy to extend still farther, and to support by the authority of St. Thomas, and St. Anselm,[1] should we not be more disposed to thank the Word for having spoken? His teaching, if it exercises the docility of the mind, affords it abundant amends and compensation, even in this world. It preserves us from dangerous errors, and assists us to understand better both our own soul and its likeness to God, and God Himself.[2] It sheds continually on the

[1] *De Fide Trinitatis*, c. ii.

[2] Lucem habitat inaccessibilem, 1 *Tim.* vi. 16.

depths of the divine nature bright light, which gladdens every upright and pure intelligence. The source whence this light radiates, does, indeed, continue *inaccessible.* Still by its lustre we have drawn near to God, we have advanced some steps on that road which, like the path of the Hebrews in the desert, is brightened by a luminous cloud; and we have left far behind us those who, from pride, precipitancy or levity, have refused to listen to the Word made flesh. But it is especially our hearts that ought to gain by the revelation of this mystery, which calls forth our adoration, or I should rather say, our love.

The first idea awakened in us by the name of God, is that of greatness, immensity, infinity of being. At that august name every knee bends, every tongue becomes mute with awe; astonishment, admiration, fear, possess our souls, long before confidence and love. The disproportion which exists between the Infinite Being and the very least of His intelligent creatures, man, yesterday non-existent, to-day in sin, to-morrow standing before His supreme tribunal,—is startlingly revealed; and there is nothing that speaks of His relations with us, of our likeness to Him, or of His merciful designs and works for the relief of our misery. Accordingly, so long as the name of Jehovah alone was known, it was simply an object of terror; no one dared to pronounce it; no man believed that it was possible to see God and live. The world was ruled by the law of fear. When Moses heard the Lord saying from the burning bush: "I AM WHO AM; thou shalt say to Pharaoh, HE WHO IS hath sent me to thee," this being, the creature of a day, must have been struck down to the earth under the weight of the Necessary, Almighty, Infinite Being.

But heaven has lowered itself to earth. The Emmanuel comes to unite the one with the other; by the shedding of His blood He has reconciled the sinner, man to his Lord and judge. It is no longer terror, it is confidence that God wishes to inspire into mortal beings redeemed

by His Son. Thenceforward these are the names under which He reveals Himself to us:

He calls Himself *Father!* Father, that is, the first principle, the communication, the outpouring of being; Father, that is goodness, providence, love . . "Father of mercies and God of all consolations . . Father of glory. . . Heavenly Father . . . Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Father . . . Our Father who is in heaven . . The one and only Father to whom we can give the name . . ." At this name of Father a sentiment entirely filial takes possession of our hearts; we feel ourselves emancipated, enriched, ennobled, brought very near to Him who is *our Father* in heaven; we exclaim with the beloved disciple: "See how the Lord hath loved us: He has granted to us that we be called and be indeed the sons of God:"[1]—we abandon ourselves with an undefinable feeling of happiness to the inspirations of that Spirit which cries aloud within us, Father! Father! and our hope is no less encouraged than our love; for *if we are the sons of God, then we are also His heirs, . . . yes, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ.*[2]

Jesus Christ—what is this name? It is that of God the *Son. The Son!* The word of itself alone tells us the whole economy of Christianity. For the Son of God has been known to us only since He made Himself the Son of man, and, in consequence, our brother! . . . Yes; Jesus Christ, who is God, is our Brother! and He does not shrink from giving us the name. "Go, tell my brethren that I ascend to my Father who is also their Father."[3] What a mystery of love: God my brother . . "God so loved the world that He gave up for us His only Son."[4] Yes, "to redeem the slave," the Church exclaims, "Thou hast delivered up the Son."[5]

[1] Videte qualem caritatem dedit nobis Pater; ut Filii Dei nominemur et simus. 1 *Joan.* iii. 1.

[2] Si filii et hæredes: hæredes quidem Dei, cohæredes autem Christi. *Rom.* viii. 17.

[3] *Joan.* xx. 17. [4] *Joan.* iii. 16.

[5] Ut servum redimeres, Filium tradidisti.

To name the Son is to name the Word made flesh, the Desired of all nations, the expectation and glory of Israel, the blessed fruit of Mary, who made Himself partaker of our miseries to make us partakers of His own greatness, and became the Son of man that we might be made the sons of God! To name the Son is to recall the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Eucharist, the heavenly glory which is the heritage of the first-born, shared with His brethren! To name the Son is to invoke "Jesus of Nazareth, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world, the Good Shepherd who giveth His life for the sheep, the spouse of the Church, devoted for His spouse, Him who was called *the friend of publicans and sinners*!" . . . At this name of Son, Jesus Christ appears before us, with all His titles to our confidence and our love; *His charity constrains us;* and we feel with the Apostle that *if He died for us, we ought to live for Him*, and we repeat in our heart: "Anathema to Him who loves not our Lord Jesus Christ!"[1]

To these names, so precious, of *Father* and *Son* there is joined a third, yet more delightful to him who is able to understand it: God calls Himself the *Holy Spirit.*

The Holy Spirit, that is *God who is charity;*[2] the substantial love of the Father and the Son; the *dove*, with its simplicity, its candor, its chaste love, hovering over the head of Jesus; the burning *fire*, shed forth upon the Apostles, destined to inflame the whole world; the *spiritual anointing*, which insinuates itself into our hearts, fixes itself there, and draws them with heavenly sweetness to love God for Himself and their neighbor for God; that *fountain of living water*, that has come down from heaven into our hearts to cleanse and to refresh them, to make them fruitful, to inebriate them with ineffable delights, and then to spring up even to heaven. This is *the Paraclete* or *the Comforter*, who diffuses in us that peace of God which surpasses all understanding; who assures us by His inward tes-

[1] 1 *Cor.* xvi. 22. [2] Deus charitas est. 1 Joan. iv.16.

timony that Christ is the truth,[1] and that we ourselves are the sons of God;[2] this is the *Gift of the Most High*, for He is *given* to us with the grace that makes us just, and He dwells in us personally, exciting in our hearts unspeakable groanings[3] towards Heaven, and crying, like little children to their father, "*Abba, Pater!*"[4] This is the *Spirit of seven-fold gift*, producing in us works that are meritorious of a blessed eternity, assuring the benefit of a glorious resurrection[5] to our bodies in which he dwells, penetrating our whole soul, to enlighten, elevate, inflame it, to make it one spirit, one heart with God.

To name the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, then, is to invoke a God who has condescended to reveal to us His infinite nature, in its mysterious depths, a manifest proof that *we are His friends*;[6] and whose whole being is in the most fatherly, the most familiar, the most intimate relations with us. It is to proclaim a God who is our Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, it is to call down upon us the protection of the Almighty Father, the Creator of heaven and earth, the salvation which the Son procured for us by His death, the grace of the Divine Spirit, which initiates us into glory.

To name the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, is to call to mind the God who brought us out of nothing, and afterwards out of the far deeper abyss of sin, in order to animate us with His own life; it is to evoke the remembrance of our Baptism conferred in the name of the three Divine Persons, of our adoption by the Father, our union with the Son in the Eucharist, our confirmation by the Holy Spirit.

Thus to confess the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, has been, ever since the time of the Apostles, the distinguishing mark of a Christian; the knowledge of

[1] 1 Joan. v. 6. [2] Rom. viii. 16. [3] Rom. viii. 26.
[4] Gal. iv. 6. [5] Rom. viii. 11.
[6] Non dicam vos servos, vos autem dixi amicos; omnia enim quæcumque audivi a Patre nota feci vobis. Joan. xv 15.

the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is the privilege reserved for the law of grace and love; it is a title to heavenly blessedness, in which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are to be revealed to us face to face. In recommending to God the souls of the dying, the Church, in order to render Him propitious to them, says: "Although he hath sinned, yet hath he never denied, but always believed in, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost." [1]

But let our worship of the adorable Trinity be above all things a worship of imitation, and let our souls, made after His image, strive to resemble Him ever more and more. Does not the perfection of an image consist entirely in its likeness to the original? Then let us mould our soul and its understanding and its will after the model of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Let us labor to give to our spiritual activity that power, that rectitude, that fecundity which are seen in the Father; let us regulate our understanding on the maxims and examples of the Word; let us submit our will to the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, and be always animated by His charity. Thus will unity and consequently order and peace reign in our whole being. Let us have but one and the same thought, one and the same will, one and the same love with all the children of our Father who is in Heaven. Let us have but *one heart and one soul*,[2] as was said of the first Christians; let there be among us no more diversity of sentiment, no more rivalry or opposition, than there is among the Three Divine Persons. This is the way to glorify our God, for the glory of a sovereign is peace in his states, that of a father, unity in his family. This is to fulfil the precepts of Jesus, and to impress on our hearts the characteristic sign of His true disciples, for He said, "By this shall all men know that you are my disci-

[1] Licet enim peccaverit, tamen Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum non negavit, sed credidit. *Ordo commend. animae.*

[2] Act. iv. 32.

ples, if you have love one for another." This is to accomplish the most ardent desire of the Heart of Jesus, from which this prayer arose, "Holy Father, keep in Thy name them whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one as we also are: . . That they may all be one, as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us. . . I in them, and Thou in me: that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that Thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast also loved me." [1]

V.

Variations of Protestants on the doctrine of the Trinity.

The Catholic Church, which we venerate as the institution of God Himself finds the dogma of the most Holy Trinity in her Scriptures, which she puts before us and explains authoritatively; and in the Apostolical tradition, which she considers as a no less sure organ of divine revelation. She requires us to believe in this dogma. By this decisive act on which our salvation depends, she obtains the submission of our understanding to the infallible word of God; she assures herself that we shall believe with the same facility the Incarnation, the Redemption, in a word, all the mysteries of Christianity, which are but appendices to the doctrine of the Trinity; she anticipates all the errors which would have obscured our views of the Deity; she inspires us with the liveliest gratitude, the most confiding love for this God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, whose whole being seems to be entirely employed upon, and as it were devoted to, the work of our sanctification; she makes us thoroughly understand that this religion, which gives us ideas of the Deity, so elevated and so sublime, could not be the productions of man's genius.

The pretended Reformation, with its various sects can never obtain these invaluable results. They have broken

[1] Joan. xvii 11, 21, 26.

all traditions, and condemned themselves to endless innovation; they have no rule of faith but scripture interpreted by private judgment, or more properly, private judgment interpreting scripture; they have repudiated Rome, as being the seat and the oracle of Antichrist; it is natural, therefore, that they should adopt the very contrary of her doctrines; they are themselves without unity, without apostolicity, without authority for giving fixedness to any belief; their point of departure was a protestation against the teaching and the practice of every age of Christianity. Starting from this, where must the Reformation end?

The leaders of the party, Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, wished to preserve the doctrine of the Trinity. Still the word itself did not please Luther, because it was not in Scripture; neither did he find there the term *consubstantial*, and therefore he could not endure it. He had the invocation, "Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us!" struck out of the litanies.[1]

Melancthon, always undecided, always ready, in his weakness, to come to terms with error, did not allow to the Son of God the divine nature, but only something of that divine nature.[2]

Calvin, in his refutation of Gentilis concedes that the Father alone can be called God *par excellence;* that if He had the power of generating His Son, it is because He wills it; that the Son is only in an improper sense Creator of heaven and earth. He disapproves that expression of the council of Nice: "God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God." He regrets that these words, Trinity, Person, Consubstantiality, have been invented. Like Luther, he dislikes the expression, *Sancta Trinitas, Unus Deus.*"[3] What he thinks of the divinity of Jesus Christ, we shall see further on.

[1] See Bellarmin, *Præf de Trinit.* [2] See Bellarmin, *Præf de Trinit.*
[3] Utinam hæc sepulta essent! *Institut.*, l. i. c. 13, and *Epist. ad Polonas*: Precatio vulgo trita est: Sancta Trinitas unus Deus. . . mihi non placet ac omnino barbariem sapit.

Zuinglius, placed Hercules, Theseus, Minos, by the side of the Son of God in heaven.

The disciples, as was natural, soon went beyond their masters. Michael Servetus published his pamphlets on "*the errors of the Trinity.*" According to him there are no distinct persons in God; the Word is only an idea of His understanding; the Fathers of Nice are blind, they are sophists in the pay of Antichrist, and Athanasius a Satanasius, who made the God of the christians a three-bodied gorgon or a three-headed cerberus; the Trinitarians are in fact Atheists. Servetus is astonished that Protestants, who regard the Pope as Antichrist, should still retain the Popish doctrine of the Trinity.[1] Calvin considered this fellow-reformer as calling faith in question, had him burned alive at Geneva in 1555, and to prevent his own right to do so being disputed, followed up the execution by a work on the necessity of punishing heretics by the sword.

A few years later, Gentilis divided the divine essence into three; another error diametrically opposed to that of Servetus. He made God the Father the Creator of the nature (essentiatorem) of the Son, and of that of the Holy Spirit, both being less than Himself. Calvin had him imprisoned, then condemned to come, barefooted and in his shirt, into the middle of the public place, to burn his book and swear that he would not go out of the city without the leave of the magistrates. Afterwards he caused him to be beheaded at Berne, as a relapsed heretic, eleven years after the burning of Servetus.

The errors of Gentilis were renewed in Germany, by Henry Nicolai; by Faydit, in France;[2] by William Sherlock in England.

The heresies of Servetus found more adherents, especially among the reformed of Poland and Transylvania. George Blandrata, Paul Alciatus, Francis David, John

[1] De erroribus Trinitatis, l. v. p. 189.

[2] *Alteration du dogme theologique par la philosophie d'Aristote.*

Crellius, &c., placed themselves at the head of these new Arians. In a public conference held at Petricaw they anathematized the council of Nice, repudiated the faith of Athanasius and Constantine, and re-established the credit of Arius, destroying at the same blow the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

Francis David went still farther: he preached that we ought to bury the gospel, and return to Moses, the law, and circumcision, considering that this was the direct line in the family of God, while Christ and His followers constituted only an indirect line.[1]

Their disciple, Faustus Socinus, merited, by his audacity, the honor of becoming in his turn the founder of a sect. His principle is, that in order to be a perfect christian it is sufficient to have a knowledge of the precepts of the Gospel. So the baptism of Christ is no longer necessary, and we may choose at will among His doctrines. Socinus expresses himself to this effect, regarding the Trinity: "It is not necessary to know that there are more Persons than one in God; it is enough to believe that there is one God. To say that there are three Persons in one God, is an absurdity."[2] From the denial of the Trinity, the Socinians were led on to conclude that Jesus Christ was no more than a mere man; that the Holy Ghost was nothing but the spirit of the Gospel ; to deny, in short, the Incarnation, Redemption, original sin, the necessity of baptism, all the sacraments, and to reduce the whole religion of Christ to simple, positive Deism.

The Arminians made the Second Person of the Trinity subordinate to the First; a system which was reproduced in the eighteenth century by William Whiston, by Samuel Clarke, and by Paul Maty, a Hollander.

The Quakers refuse to explain themselves clearly on the doctrine of the Trinity. "The belief in the divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," they say, "led some of the Fathers of the Christian church, about

[1] Bellarmin, loc. cit.

[2] *Brevissima institutio*, l. i.

three centuries after the personal coming of Christ, to establish a doctrine to which they gave the name of Trinity, a term which we rarely use in our writings, preferring, on this subject, to confine ourselves to the language of Scripture,"[1] &c.

Swedenborg rejects the Trinity, as adored by Catholics, in a more formal manner, and replaces it by another entirely of his own inventing. According to him, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are nothing more than the action of God in creating, redeeming, and regenerating.[2]

This is the course pursued by most of the theologians who teach from the reformed pulpits. Some disfigure the doctrine by accommodating it to their own particular notions. Others discover the Trinity among the Egyptians, the Indians, the Jews, in Plato, &c., while they refuse to recognize it in christian tradition and in scripture.[3] Many, seeing that their brethren, for want of a guide, lose themselves in the explanation of this mystery, and fall, some into Tritheism, others into Sabellianism, conclude that it is necessary to give up this insidious doctrine, so well named by Gregory Paul, a stratagem of Satan.[4] At Geneva, in 1777, the thesis was maintained that the Father alone could be called God. M. Chenevière teaches that the doctrine of the Trinity was unknown to the primitive Church, and that it is contrary to reason and to Scripture.[5]

Owing to all these contradictions the faith of Protestants in the Holy Trinity has been so weakened, that in 1720, an English lady founded eight annual Sermons to support it.[6] We may question the efficacy of this extreme

[1] *Exposition succincte des principes religieux des Amis ou Quakers*, par H. Tuke, p. 47.

[2] *Sum. Exposit. novæ doctrinæ*, n. 118.

[3] Cudworth refuted by Mosheim. Le Clerc refuted by Baltus, in his work: *Defense des Peres accuses de platonisme.* Ammon, Eichhorn, etc.

[4] Wegscheider, Cannabich, etc. The German Rationalists.

[5] *Essais theologiques. De la Trinite.* [6] Lady Moyer's Lectures.

remedy. A surer antidote would be found in returning to the bosom of the Catholic Church, which has always maintained among her children, and always will maintain, a worship of faith, of hope, and of love to the honor of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

On Original Sin.

Fourth Session of the Council

I.

Of the natural and supernatural in man.

From the contemplation of God, where we have seen a Father full of mercy, a Son ready to become our brother, a Holy and sanctifying Spirit, let us turn our eyes on man, His creature and His image. Instead of mercy we shall behold misery, instead of the Saviour the unhappy being He has to save, instead of the sanctifying Spirit, that perverted spirit which is to be set right and healed: in contrast to the mystery of infinite perfection will be shown the mystery of precocious wickedness, of profound degradation.

Had not sin darkened our understanding, we should have perceived in our souls, with as much facility as delight, the traces of their likeness to the August Trinity. With the same ease we should have understood the nature of our being, and the excellence of the gifts which the divine liberality had superadded to our humanity. But, alas! "all things are become difficult for us,"[1] most especially the knowledge of ourselves, and therefore the philosophers of antiquity recommended to man, as the most serious and most important of studies that of himself: *Know thyself.*

Now in order to know ourselves, we should first of all learn to distinguish, as is done by the Fathers, and by

[1] Cunctæ res difficiles, *Eccl.* I. 8.

Catholic, and even by Protestant, theologians, the *natural* and the *supernatural*.

That is *natural*, in the literal sense, which must belong to a nature created or possible, in order that it may be such or such a being; as for instance, a star, a plant, an animal, a man, an angel.

The *supernatural* is what God vouchsafes gratuitously to superadd to this created being, by communicating to it what is properly His own; or, according to the expression of St. Peter, making it partake of His very nature, *ut per hæc efficiamini divinæ consortes naturæ*.[1]

The water which refreshes or purifies us produces an effect that belongs to itself, the result of its own properties—a *natural* effect. The water which regenerates us at the baptismal font produces an effect altogether beyond its nature, and of which God alone can be the author—a *supernatural* effect.

The religious society which we call the Catholic Church, appeared to us at the very beginning to be distinguished from every other society by characteristics which human nature, left simply to its own powers, cannot possess, but which appertain to the nature of God: unity, sanctity, and the rest. These characteristics are *supernatural*, and indicate in the Church a *supernatural* origin and institution.

On the proposal by the church we admitted certain books as *sacred*, that is, distinguished from all others, which are therefore called *profane*, by the *supernatural* fact of their divine inspiration.

A certain idea of God, the supreme cause of all that exists is *natural* to man; the sure knowledge of the Trinity could only be given him by a *supernatural* revelation.

Those persons who deny the supernatural deny all divine action, distinct from creation and preservation. They are accordingly obliged to reject all mysteries, all miracles, the Incarnation, and, in a word, the whole of

[1] II Pet. i. 4.

Christianity. Hence many go on to deny the principal duties of natural religion, as prayer; and some even the very existence of God. This is the course in which, after Spinosa's example, Kant, Schelling, Fichte, and Hegel have gone in Germany; Cousin, Saisset, Amedée-Jacques, and the Editor of the "*Liberte de penser*" in France; Woolston and Hume in England. It is certain that the number of *supernaturalist* theologians is daily decreasing among Protestants. The majority are nothing more than professors of natural theology.[1] It is high time, then, to return to a better track.

If we consider man by the light of reason alone, setting aside all action of God upon him beyond creation and preservation, his natural state appears to be this: Philosophy perceives in him an intelligent soul, and a body personally united thereto for its use and service. His understanding, by means of a certain exertion of attention and reasoning, enables him to perceive truth, and to see God in things created, as the cause is perceived in its effects. His will leads him towards happiness or the satisfaction of his desires; his freedom chooses as the object of its action, a good, real or apparent, permanent or transitory, beneficial or destructive. His body, attracted by sensible good, is subject to the general laws which direct the vicissitudes of matter, and consequently is liable to deterioration and even to dissolution, when it has to submit to the interior or exterior shock of opposing elements. Such is man as nature or rather creation made him; an image of God in his understanding and will, but assuredly an image with very little resemblance to the original.

Truth shall now show us the supernatural state in which God vouchsafed to place him. Let us suppose that to all these conditions essential to the nature of man, the Lord, by an entirely gratuitous act of bounty, super-

[1] Valroger, *Etudes sur le rationalisme contemporain;* Stœudlin, *Histoire du rationalisme.*

adds the most excellent gifts; that instead of placing him in the valley of tears He gives him a delightful abode in Paradise, and there manifests Himself to him; instead of leaving his understanding to a laborious search after truth, He converses familiarly with him to enlighten him by His brightest illuminations; instead of allowing his heart to remain exposed to all the caprices of a liberty solicited by unworthy passions, He infuses into it the pure love of the infinite and eternal good, without at the same time depriving it of free will; instead of exposing his unprotected body to all the attacks of inanimate matter, He supplies a remedy against death besides that which food affords against hunger; that to this image of His own Being He adds a resemblance to Himself; and, more than all, in bestowing all these gifts on man, the Creator designs to prepare him for receiving throughout eternity a still more perfect communication of His own life, and a kind of enjoyment of Himself;—such is a sketch of what theology calls the *supernatural* state.

The end or term of this supernatural state is everlasting *glory*, which is an ineffable participation in the divine life; and the means afforded for attaining thereto is *grace*, the help that is, with which God anticipates and accompanies our soul to assist it in seeking after and arriving at glory.

We will endeavor to throw light on this doctrine by an illustration; at the same time premising, that no comparison can be perfectly exact, because man is the only created being we see that is capable of being raised to a supernatural state, properly so called.

The great Apostle, in the contrast he draws between the Jews and Gentiles, compares Israel to the *cultivated* and the Gentiles to the *wild olive-tree*.[1] This comparison, inspired by the Holy Ghost, may assist us in distinguishing man in a supernatural state, from man as he is by nature. Examine. then, this olive tree which has sprung

[1] Rom. xi. 17.

up without cultivation in the midst of the forest; its roots have not been nourished by rich earth, nor its growth directed; it has not been freed from useless branches by the hand of the pruner; it can bear only sour and bitter fruit. In the fruit tree deprived of man's culture, we behold an image of man without the culture of God. But give this tree by grafting and assiduous care a new sap, a better life, you make it bear choice fruit, which its own nature unassisted could not have given it, you raise it above its natural condition, you make it no untrue representation of the supernatural man.

This distinction being well understood, we may establish the following propositions.

II.

The primitive state of man was a supernatural state.

Man was originally created in a supernatural state. Catholics and Protestants agree on this; although Lutherans do not understand the supernatural as we have explained it. This supernatural state is, what the Apostle calls: "The new man created according to God in justice and holiness of truth;"[1] what the book of Genesis calls *the likeness of man to God;* and the council of Trent, "the constitution of man in sanctity and justice."[2]

By this supernatural state all the faculties of man were made much more excellent than they now are. His mind was enlightened by the *spiritual knowledge*[3] which was infused into him by the word of the Lord. His will was perfectly regulated and in order, subject to God, the undisturbed mistress of the senses, established in profound peace, unacquainted with shame or with remorse.[4] His

[1] Novum hominem qui secundum Deum creatus est in justitia et sanctitate veritatis. *Eph.* iv. 24.

[2] Sanctitatem et justitiam in qua constitutus erat.

[3] Creavit illis scientiam spiritus. *Eccl.* xvii. 6.

[4] Erant uterque nudus et non erubescebant. *Genes.* ii. 25.

body, says the book of Wisdom, had been created *incorruptible*, that is to say, it was to be secured from that dissolution which we call death, and which the entire Scripture teaches us is the consequence of sin.[1] Lastly, his whole being was protected by the sanctity of his soul against the innumerable pains, afflictions and miseries which make this earth a prison and a place of banishment.

It is not by Scripture and Catholic tradition alone that the existence of this state of original justice and felicity is proved. Traces of it are found in the traditions of all nations. Plato calls it the golden age; the Greek and Latin poets have celebrated it as the reign of Saturn. The beautiful descriptions of it by Virgil, Juvenal, Ovid, Tibullus, are universally known. We learn from Plutarch the tradition of the Persians, from Strabo that of the Indians, from the Kings or sacred books of China that of the Chinese, all which harmonize in substance with the Christian tradition.

Let us not lose sight of the fact, that this blessed state of primeval man was supernatural, or superadded quite gratuitously to what was required by the physical and moral condition of humanity. Neither let us forget that happiness, knowledge, exemption from death and suffering—all these supernatural gifts had for their groundwork and support the sanctity and justice in which man had been created.

III.

Sin and fall of the first man.

From the beginning, man was a free agent, though the pretended reformers of Christianity do not allow him free will.

He was free, and we know how sad a use he made of his freedom. . . It is not necessary to repeat here the

[1] Sap. ii. 23.

lamentable story, so beautifully narrated in Genesis.[1] Sammael, the ancient Hebrews said, is the prince of the evil spirits, who led the woman to sin. It was "by the envy of the devil," says the book of Wisdom, that "*death came into the world*,"[2] and here we see why he is called, "a murderer from the beginning."[3] Zoroaster gives the name of Ahriman to the evil genius who, under the appearance of the serpent, led the first man to evil. Prometheus stealing fire from heaven, Hercules seizing upon the golden apples in the garden of the Hesperides, are poetic fictions based upon the narrative of scripture. It may be read inscribed in hieroglyphic characters on the walls of ancient Thebes; it has been found among the Indians, the Chinese, the Mexicans. And accordingly Voltaire was forced to admit that "the fall of degenerate man was the foundation of the theology of all the ancient nations."[4]

The sin of our first parents was grave; the more grave in proportion as the command to be observed was light, the graces to be abused in order to do evil more abundant, the penalty with which the transgression was menaced more terrible.

This sin, which the Apostle calls *disobedience*,[5] is elsewhere characterized by our sacred books as a kind of *apostacy*, a falling off from God, *inspired by pride*.[6] It was aggravated by the blackest ingratitude, by a formal contempt for the Creator, and even, at least on the part of the woman, by positive *unbelief*, for she trusted the word of the devil rather than that of God.[7]

This sin, like every other, implies a threefold disorder,

[1] Genes. iii. [2] Sap. ii. 24.

[3] Ipse erat homicida ab initio. *Joan.* viii. 44.

[4] *Philosophie de l'histoire*, c. xvii. See on the universality of this tradition: *Essais sur l'indifference*, t. iii, c. 28.

[5] Inobedienta unius hominis. *Rom.* v. 19.

[6] Initium superbiæ hominis apostatare a Deo. *Eccl.* x. 14.

[7] Nequaquem moriemini, sed aperientur oculi vestri, et eritis sicut Dii, scientes bonum et malum. *Genes.* iii. 4.

which renders the sinner subject to a threefold penalty. Man, in transgressing, refuses to direct himself towards God, his last end, and to seek his blessedness and glory in Him; he thereby deserves that God should forsake and abandon him, cease to draw him to Himself, and turn from him with all His gifts and graces.

More than this, the sinner makes himself his own master, his own sovereign, his own God. He merits, therefore, that the being which he has thus withdrawn from the divine authority, should be taken from him by death, and so replaced under the absolute dominion of the Creator.

Finally, by their sin, our first parents had withdrawn from the empire of God, not only their own senses, not only the forbidden tree and its fruit, but all those created things which had been designed to praise and bless their Author by the intervention of man, and had used them to offend Him. The sun had to shed light on their disorders, the earth to support their steps in crime, the tempter had triumphed over them. This abuse of the creatures and of themselves deserved to be punished by the revolt of their senses and of all creation: the earth, covered with thorns and thistles was thenceforth to be watered by their sweat, and only yield unwillingly their daily bread; the terrestrial paradise was to become a valley of tears; the sufferings of the woman, who is henceforward the subject of the man, were to be multiplied with her child-bearings; and humanity itself, mere dust now justly cursed, was condemned soon to return to dust.

Thus the first father and mother of mankind lost, by their disobedience, sanctity, justice, the friendship of God which constituted the life of their souls, and consequently the supernatural gifts which formed, as it were, the portion of their primitive state. We behold them now become the objects of God's just wrath and indignation, fallen under the bondage of sin, and the empire of Satan,

given up as a prey to irregular appetites, and to every form of moral and physical suffering, subject to death, and for ever deprived of that glory to which God had predestined them. From the supernatural state in which the Lord had placed them, they are fallen into a state of *mere* nature, or rather of *fallen nature*, which is the term sanctioned by theological use.

Such was their *sin*, such its penalty; let us now see what its *transmission* may have been.

IV.

On the transmission of this sin.

We must observe that the word *sin*, in its common acceptation, is used in two different senses; first, for the formal *act* of disobedience to God, in which sense we speak of *committing a sin;* secondly, for the habitual *state* in which that man is, who in consequence of his own criminal *act* has been deprived of the sanctifying grace and the friendship of God. It is in this latter sense that we say of a man who is guilty and does not repent, that he lives, that he dies, that he is dead *in sin*. Sin, considered in this point of view, may be defined: the *privation* (not merely the negation or absence) but *the privation, the being despoiled of the supernatural perfection which man ought to have had, in virtue of a right founded on the divine promises, and which he was bound to preserve.*

God had promised man and his posterity, if he persevered in fidelity, always to superadd to his mere human life, that abundant participation in the divine nature which we call the supernatural life of grace, during his time of trial, and the supernatural life of glory in eternity. Man sins, and is justly despoiled both of the life of grace and that of glory. He is in a state of sin.

Now it is in this state of loss, of denudation, of just deprivation of that supernatural perfection to which the divine promises gave us a right, and which we were

under an obligation to preserve, that we are born; we are born, therefore, *in a state of sin.*

This state is also called *a state of death*, because it is the privation of that life superior to nature, which God had originally infused into humanity.

Adam could not transmit to us what he no longer possessed; *nemo dat quod non habet.* The transmission of sin, therefore, is simply the non-transmission of the justice and supernatural life lost by our first parents.[1]

That life would have been transmitted to us, if the head of the human family had continued in justice. On this supposition there would have been a mystery to explain at this point; viz., how supernatural life, a positive, gratuitous gift superadded to nature, could be transmitted with flesh and blood. In the actual hypothesis, however, there is no transmission, properly so called. The possessions to be transmitted were fatally lost for himself and for us by the fault of our first father. This is all we have to believe, without taking a part on one side or the other in the opinions controverted in the schools.

In regard to the heavenly kingdom we are disinherited princes, in a condition similar to that, in which so many kings and grandsons of kings are to be found in Europe at this day, dispossessed of their thrones, which yet the constitution of their country had made hereditary.

A wild tree, our nature had been regenerated by the ingenious process of grafting. A fruitful branch, which was to change its savage state and make it productive of choicest fruits, had been inserted by the hand of the good gardener into this barren stock. But, alas, before the tree, transformed by those cares, is able to multiply itself, an envious hand comes to take away the graft, and throw far off the branch it bore. What must be the result? The wild stock resumes its original nature; it produces, as before, bitter fruits, and all that may spring from it will be wild and worthless till the gardener tries a new

[1] Perrone, *De Peccato, Orig,* part. iii, c. 4.

operation. Such is the history of our humanity. But the new operation will be tried; it will succeed. Let us then have hope.

To inquire into the reason of original sin, is to ask why a son is naturally like his father. This resemblance is according to a law most wise, the source of all that we admire in the universe of unity, perpetuity, love and harmony. Without this law the world would be the receptacle of monsters, all unknown, all enemies to each other, like that leathern bag in which the Roman law ordered the parricide to be thrown into the sea, in company with animals most bitter against man, most hostile to each other. It is in virtue of this law that the family, nay, the human race exists; the universe (κόσμος) derives its name from the order and beauty which are its result; and even in the bosom of the Trinity the Son of God is like unto, and consubstantial with His Father.

What Adam transmits to us by generation, is human nature reduced to its own narrow limits and to its original resources alone. An understanding applying itself, not without painful effort, to the search after truth, ignorant of much, and allowing itself to be easily misled through inattention or prejudice; a will pursuing happiness with impatient eagerness, and very soon giving way when the attainment of it calls for energy and resolution; a liberty too often restive against the restraints of law and with a propensity to the goods of sense; a concupiscence, hard to regulate and keep in subjection; a body frail and exposed to disease, which grows up painfully, must be provided with what is needful for it with much toil, and after an uncertain number of short and evil days, succumbs amid sufferings. In a word, what is transmitted to us is a nature most justly despoiled and disinherited of the goods of grace and glory, condemned to suffering and to death. Such is the teaching of the Scripture. Let us be satisfied with citing St. Paul: "By one man death entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death

passed upon all men, by the fault of him in whom all have sinned."[1] "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive."[2]

Such is also the belief of tradition. St. Irenæus says that in Adam we were transgressors of the law of God; that consequently we have become His enemies and blind, and that thus the divine Son, coming to restore both our sight and life, has every right to address to us those merciful words, "Your sins are forgiven you."[3] He sees in human nature the barren fig-tree which our Saviour saw on the wayside.

Tertullian, in most of his works, reveals the fact that the whole of mankind is degraded, and condemned with Adam its first father. According to St. Hilary, the whole human race has gone astray in the wanderings of its head; his sin has deprived us of the prerogatives of our happy creation, and brought upon us the sentence of death and suffering: in ourselves there is nothing pure, nothing innocent. Jesus Christ, in taking our flesh did not take our sin:[4] He is the good Shepherd who came to seek in our human race the lost sheep. It is by Adam, says St. Athanasius, "that sin and death have passed on all men."[5] "We are stained before our birth," says St. Ambrose. "We have all sinned in the first man; Adam is in every one of us; in him human nature has fallen, through him alone sin has passed into us all."[6]

But it was St. Augustine who specially devoted himself to defend the mystery of original sin, in opposition to the Pelagians. He proves its existence by scripture, by the dogma of the necessity of Baptism, and the ceremonies which accompany its administration. To explain

[1] Rom. v. 12-21.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.
[3] *Adv. Hæres*, lib. v. passim.
[4] In Matth. c. xviii; in Ps. lix. n. 4; in Job, Fragm.
[5] *Cont. Arian.* Or. i. n. 51. De Trin. l. i. n. 13.
[6] Apol. David, c. xi; *Epist.* lxxiii; de *Myst.* c. vi.

how the children of those who have been regenerated are yet born polluted by sin, he has recourse to several illustrations. Thus, he says, "the children of the circumcised Jews come into the world uncircumcised. From wheat cleared of the chaff springs wheat mixed with chaff: from the berry of the cultivated olive grow wild olive trees.[1] St. John Chrysostom, whose orthodoxy on this point is vindicated by St. Augustine, teaches that it is by Adam we have been driven from Paradise, that by his sin we have been despoiled of many blessings; that Jesus Christ died for the salvation of all men, &c.[2]

Thus we may refute the Pelagians, ancient and modern; the Socinians, whose leader expresses himself thus in his treatise on Justification: "the supposition of original sin, or the fault of our first parents, is a Jewish fiction . . . which antichrist introduced into the church for the purpose of establishing pernicious doctrines, such as the Incarnation and the baptism of infants." . . . Thus we confute all our modern rationalists, Ammon, Rosenmüller, Poster, Baur, and the rest, who are alarmed at the very shadow of the supernatural. On the fifth of May, 1817, the venerable company of pastors of Geneva forbade the agitation of the question of original sin thenceforward in the schools.

Man, then, is fallen; but as we are told very clearly and very loudly by the voice of conscience, reason, common sense and faith, man, even when fallen, is still free. Yes, free, fully and perfectly free. When the Council of Trent says that our free will has been weakened (*attenuatum*) and bent (*inclinatum*), it speaks, not of our essential liberty which is entire, but of liberty as God had given it to Adam, endowed with a supernatural strength and rectitude.[3]

[1] De Nuptiis et concup. l. i. c. 19. De Peccat. meritis, l. iii. c. 8, contra Julianum passim.

[2] In Genes. *Serm.* v.

[3] Perrone, *ibid.*

Luther,[1] Calvin,[2] Zwinglius,[3] Œcolampadius,[4] Bucer, denied this freedom. According to Luther, it did not exist even before man sinned. Since the fall man has been a pillar of salt, a stock, a stone, a lifeless image, without eyes, without mouth, without heart. His will, placed between God and Satan, allows itself to be led like a horse by the bridle, now by one, now by the other. When Erasmus alleged in objection, the commandments of God, which presuppose our freedom, Luther answered that the commandments showed what man ought to do, not what he was able to do! . . . This was shamefully giving the reins to all the passions; it was to debase and degrade man more than Adam could have done; it was to suppose God not only *unjust*, inasmuch as He punished sin that was necessarily committed, but *senseless*, since he imposed laws on an automaton, a machine. Undoubtedly, this was a strange Reformation! To reform liberty, you annihilate it; to extirpate sin, you declare that sin is necessary; to make men observe the law you proclaim that it is impossible to do so; to lead them to love God, you represent Him as the author of sin, the author of the treason of Judas, as well as of the calling of St. Paul.

Yes, we are free. All laws human and divine, all the eulogiums accorded to virtue, all the penalties decreed against crime, all theories of education, morals and legislation, the feelings of remorse which are the commencement of the punishment of sin here in this world, the sweet satisfaction which is a recompense of duty, common

[1] Ex sese et propriis naturalibus suis viribus, nihil inchoare, operari aut co-operari potest (homo) non plus quam lapis, truncus aut limus. (*Solid. decl.* ii de lib. arbitrio, § 21.) The good actions of the heathen are, according to Melancthon, (Loc. Theol. 35,) the fruits of a cursed tree. The human will is without strength as far as spiritual things are concerned.

[2] *Inst.* l. ii. c. 1 §§ 8 and 9. Quidquid in homine est peccatum est.

[3] Omnia cujusvis hominis consilia peccatum sunt. Zuinglius, *Ver. et fals. relig.*, vol. iii, p, 171. See *the Reformation* by Döllinger, t. iii.

[4] Peccatum est quidquid fiat; etiam virtutes illæ philosophicæ peccata sunt. *In Jes.*, lib. iv, fol. 123.

sense, our very innermost feeling,—everything demonstrates to us this truth which is of all truths the most evident, the most indisputable, the most intuitively felt by us all, that we are free. Nay, those very persons who denied the freedom of man, believed in it themselves, just as we do. The proof is that they wished to determine their contemporaries to act *through conviction* in a fashion which in their eyes was better, which they called *reformed*. In their conduct they were full of caution, foresight, reflection; we see them deliberate, take counsel, exhort, reprove, praise, punish, prepare confessions of faith, draw up laws, point out abuses. All this supposes that they were free, and that they believed their fellow-men to be free likewise.

Free, not merely to choose, like the devils, between this and that evil, but to choose between good and evil. Cain, the first born of Adam, seeing his sacrifice rejected by the Lord, who prefers that of Abel, abandons himself to a violent impulse of jealousy and rage: *Iratus est vehementer, et concidit vultus ejus.*[1] The Lord vouchsafes to speak to him in these words: "Why art thou angry? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou do well, shalt thou not receive a recompense? But if ill, shall not sin forthwith be present at the door? but the lust thereof shall be under thee, and thou shalt have dominion over it: *Sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius.*"[2]

Moses, after promulgating the law of the Most High, cries out: "Behold I set before you this day blessing and cursing: blessing, if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I have declared to you; cursing, which you will not escape, if you transgress the law of the Lord your God, and depart out of the way I have set before you, and follow after strange gods whom ye have not known."[3]

And the Redeemer Himself, after bringing the old law to its perfection, invites the free will of man to submit to

[1] Genes. iv. 5. [2] Genes. iv. 6, 7. [3] See Deut. xxx. 15-21.

it: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." . . . "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."[1] . . . "Take my yoke upon you. . . . My yoke is sweet, and my burden light."[2] But what need is there to insist longer on this truth? Is there one single man in the whole world, who in good faith dare repeat after Luther, that free-will is nothing but a slave-will; that liberty is but an empty word; that original sin positively forms the substance of man, and that the fœtus in its mother's womb is sin?[3]

"Here and there," says M. Chenevière,[4] "men of iron will are found who maintain these ideas, but the masses of the people are gradually alienated from them, despite of the efforts made to re-attract them; and a day will come when the human mind will have made such progress, that Calvinists will be found only in books."

Let us conclude with some reflections on the remedy for original sin.

V.

The remedy of Original Sin. . . The Immaculate Conception of Mary.

Could man, a sinner by the powers of his own nature, alone, recover the supernatural life which he had lost?

Evidently not.—That nature by the exercise of its own strength, should attain to that which is beyond the reach of all its strength, of all its powers, is a contradiction in terms. It would be easier for a non-existent being to call itself into life; for a brute to transform itself into a man, or a man into an angel.

In consequence of sin, God has been lost to man. Now, who can restore God, re-purchase, re-conquer God for the

[1] Matth. xix. 21. [2] Matth. xi. 29, 30.

[3] Fœtus in utero, antequam nascamur et homines esse incipimus, peccatum est. *Comment in Genes.* c. iii. and in Psalm L.

[4] *Essais theologiques*, vol. i, p. 283.

benefit of man deprived of God, except God Himself and God alone?

But God has withdrawn from man, because sin has done an infinite wrong to His infinite majesty. In order to set man free from the debt of sin, who shall be able to offer to God's justice a satisfaction equal to the wrong? to honor God as much as sin has dishonored Him? to render to Him an honor, a glory, an expiation worthy of Him, equal to Him, if it be not God Himself and God alone?

It is necessary then that the Deity should intervene personally in the redemption of man. He who drew him out of nothing can alone withdraw him out of that still deeper abyss into which his wickedness has cast him.

Man must also intervene, but man put by the Creator in a condition to represent humanity worthily, to be suitably accredited to the God of all virtues, to instruct his brethren by the most perfect example, and, if infinite justice should require it, to undergo the penalty of sin.

This man and this God, who for our salvation, must unite their agencies, the one completed by the other, will be the Man-God, JESUS-CHRIST. The new Adam, sanctifying us by His obedience, as the first Adam ruined us by his rebellion; regenerating us in justice, as the first generated us in iniquity; associating with Himself in this work of our resurrection, the purest and humblest of virgins, as the first allowed himself to be hurried on to his destruction and ours by a proud and sensual woman.

We have named Mary, her whom the Archangel saluted as "full of grace, blessed among women;"[1] her who shrank not from saying herself: "He that is mighty hath done great things to me;"[2] that Virgin of virgins to whom the Church applies those words which could be appropriated to no other created being: "Thou art all fair, there is not a spot in thee;"[3] her whom the second Council of Nice calls *purer than the very Angels*, and the Coun-

[1] Luc. i. 28. [2] Luc. i. 49. [3] Cant. iv. 7.

cil of Ephesus *Immaculate.* The greatest doctors of the church, St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Bernard, St. Thomas, have emulated each other in their encomiums of her superhuman purity. To St. Anselm these beautiful words are attributed: "It was fitting that that Virgin should shine with a resplendent purity—than which none greater could be imagined short of God—to whom the eternal Father was preparing to give His only Son to be her true Son, whom the Son Himself was choosing to be His real mother, and in whom the Holy Spirit willed and was about to effect the conception of Him from whom He Himself proceeds."

The Greek Church since the fifth century, the Latin Church since the twelfth, have celebrated the Conception of Mary, a sufficiently evident proof that that conception was holy. Sixtus IV. had approved an office of the *Immaculate Conception;* most of the Sovereign Pontiffs from that time forward had encouraged the belief in this privilege, which the most celebrated universities of the christian world swore to defend. The Council of Trent, as it had been assembled not to define questions controverted among Catholic doctors, but to establish the faith imperilled by innovators, declares, that it does not intend to include in its decree on original sin, the blessed and Immaculate Mary, Mother of God. This is intimating, clearly enough, that in the decree passed in heaven, there had been a like exception, in favor of His *blessed and ever Immaculate Mother*, out of regard to Jesus Christ, from honor for Him, and by virtue of His merits.

As respects our Saviour Himself, we conceive it necessary to bring before you, summarily, in the next chapter the proofs of His divinity.

FIFTH SESSION.

HELD JUNE 17, 1546.

Decree concerning Original Sin

That our Catholic *faith, without which it is impossible to please God,*[1] may, errors being purged away, continue in its own perfect and spotless integrity, and that the Christian people may not be carried about with every wind of doctrine;[2] whereas that old serpent, the perpetual enemy of mankind, amongst the very many evils with which the Church of God is in these our times troubled, has also stirred up not only new, but even old, dissensions, touching original sin, and the remedy thereof; the sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the three same legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein,—wishing now to come to the reclaiming of the erring, and the confirming of the wavering, —following the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, of the holy Fathers, of the most approved Councils, and of the judgment and consent of the Church itself, ordains, confesses, and declares these things touching the said original sin.

1. If any one does not confess that the first man, Adam, when he had transgressed the commandment of God in paradise, immediately lost the holiness and justice wherein he had been constituted; and that he incurred, through the offence of that prevarication, the wrath and indignation of God, and consequently death, with which God had previously threatened him, and, together with death, captivity under his power who thenceforth *had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil,*[3] and that the entire Adam, through that offence of prevarication, was changed, in body and soul, for the worse; let him be anathema.

2. If any one asserts, that the prevarication of Adam injured himself alone, and not his posterity; and that the holiness and justice, received of God, which he lost, he lost for himself alone, and not for us also; or that he, being defiled by the sin of disobedience, has only transferred death, and pains of the body, into the whole human race, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul; let him be anathema:—since he contradicts the apostle who says: *By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned.*[4]

3. If any one asserts, that this sin of Adam,—which in its origin is one, and being transfused into all by propagation, not by imitation, is in each one as his own,[5]—is taken away either by the powers of human nature, or by any other remedy than

[1] Hebr. xi. 6. [2] Ephes. iv. 14. [3] Hebr. ii. 14.
[4] Rom. v. 12. [5] Inest unicuique proprium.

the merit of the *one mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ,*[1] *who hath reconciled us to God in his own blood, made unto us justice, sanctification, and redemption;*[2] or if he denies that the said merit of Jesus Christ is applied, both to adults and to infants, by the sacrament of baptism rightly administered in the form of the Church; let him be anathema: *For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved.*[3] Whence that voice: *Behold* the lamb of God, behold him who taketh away the sins of the world;[4] and that other: *As many as have been baptized, have put on Christ.*[5]

4. If any one denies, that infants, newly born from their mothers' wombs, even though they be sprung from baptized parents, are to be baptized; or says that they are *baptized indeed for the remission of sins,*[6] but that they derive nothing of original sin from Adam, which has need of being expiated by the laver of regeneration for the obtaining life everlasting,—whence it follows as a consequence, that in them the form of baptism, *for the remission of sins,* is understood to be not true, but false—let him be anathema. For that which the apostle has said, *By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death, and so death passd upon all men in whom all have sinned,*[7] is not to be understood otherwise than as the Catholic Church spread everywhere hath always understood it. For, by reason of this rule of faith, from a tradition of the apostles, even infants, who could not as yet commit any sin of themselves, are for this cause truly baptized, *for the remission of sins,* that in them that may be cleansed away by regeneration, which they have contracted by generation. *For, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*[8]

5. If any one denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away; but says that it is only rased,[9] or not imputed; let him be anathema. For, in those who are *born again,* there is nothing that God hates; because, *There is no condemnation to those who are* truly *buried with Christ by baptism into death;*[10] *who walk not according to the flesh,* but, *putting off the old man and putting on the new who is created according to God,*[11] are made innocent, immaculate, pure, harmless, and beloved of God, *heirs indeed of God, but joint heirs with Christ;*[12] so that there is nothing whatever

[1] I Tim. ii. 5. [2] I Cor. i. 30. [3] Act iv. 12.
[4] Joan. i. 29. [5] Gal. iii. 27. [6] Act. ii. 38.
[7] Rom. v. 12. [8] Joan. iii. 5. [9] Radi, cancelled.
[10] Rom. viii. 1; vi. 4. [11] Ephes. iv. 22, 24. [12] Rom. viii. 7.

to retard their entrance into heaven. But this holy synod confessses and is sensible, that in the baptized there remains concupiscence, or an incentive (to sin);"[1] which, whereas it is left for our exercise,[2] cannot injure those who consent not, but resist manfully by the grace of Jesus Christ; yea, he who shall have *striven lawfully shall be crowned*.[3] This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin,[4] the holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in those *born again*, but because it is of sin, and inclines to sin. And if any one is of a contrary sentiment, let him be anathema.

This same holy Synod doth nevertheless declare, that it is not its intention to include in this decree, where original sin is treated of, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV.,[5] of happy memory are to be observed, under the pains contained in the said constitutions, which it renews.

See the constitution of Sixtus IV, commencing with these words; *Cum præ excelsa*, and the other which begins thus: *Grave nimis*, the bull of Pius V, *Super specula*, 1570; that of Paul V, *Regis pacifici*, 1616; the decree of the same in the Gen. cong. of the 31st Aug., 1617, forbidding any one ever to dare to say in public that the Virgin has sinned in Adam: extended afterwards to private acts by Gregory XV, in the General Congregation of May 24, 1622. However the bull *Eximii atque singularis* of the same year permits the Friar Preachers to discuss this question, but only in private and among themselves.

The Bishop and clergy of Paris had condemned in a very solemn manner, and long before the council of Basle, those who would speak against the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, as is related by Jean Juvenal des Ursins, Archbishop of Reims, in the history of Charles VI, in the year 1387.

[1] **Fomitem.**
[2] **Ad agonem, to be wrestled with.**
[3] II Tim. ii. 5.
[4] Rom. vi.—viii.
[5] Extravag. Cum præexcelsa, et Grave nimis 1 et 2 de Relig. et venerate. sanct int. comm.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

On the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

I.

Design of God in the Redemption—Principal facts of the mystery of the Incarnation.

The Holy Trinity had said at the beginning, according to the narrative of Moses, "Let us make man to our image and likeness."[1] But, alas! sin very soon disfigured that image; that power was overthrown, that intelligence obscured, that love mis-directed. Man fell into an abyss deeper than that of non-existence,—the abyss of sin. As soon as there were two brothers in the world, we behold a fratricide; as soon as the daughters of Eve were multiplied in the family of Cain, the children of God were drawn aside by their seductions; and very soon man, a slave to infamous passions, "was no longer anything but flesh,"[2] and God cast this foulness into the waters of the deluge, or consumed it by fire from heaven in the cities of the plain. From Cain to Noah, from Cham to Tiberius, how sad a history is that of the human race! Into what an abyss of error and misery had it precipitated itself, and what a destiny had it prepared for its eternal future!

The exceeding greatness of our misery loudly cried to the divine mercy; that mercy relented; and in order to raise up fallen man, God conceived in that heart in which "there is plentiful redemption,"[3] a design more admirable than that of creation itself,[4] a design which made His infinite wisdom shine forth with an entirely new glory to the astonished view of the Angels.[5]

[1] Genes. i. 26. [2] Genes. vi. 3. [3] Ps. cxxix. 7.

[4] Mirabiliter condidisti, mirabilius reformasti. *Liturg.*

[5] Per eam innotescit Angelis multiformis sapientia Dei.

By the execution of this plan the Deity procured for Himself adoration, homages, reparations as great as Himself; while man and the whole universe find in union with the God-Man, not pardon only, but all the perfection, all the greatness, all the blessedness of which they are capable. Thus is "glory" given "to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will."[1]

Infinite justice and infinite mercy have exchanged the kiss of peace.[2] Justice renders to God the immeasurable satisfaction which is due to Him; to sin, all the chastisement which it deserves; to the innocent Head, smitten because of His guilty members, the everlasting glory which He has merited by His voluntary humiliations. But mercy beams forth more brightly even than justice: God's love gives us all that is most dear to Himself, His only, His beloved Son,[3] and in Him, and with Him all blessings are accorded to us.[4] So God loved the world![5] It is then most true that "He is charity,"[6] and that the special mark of a Christian is to believe in the love of God for men;[7] and when we contemplate the remedy which the divine goodness vouchsafes to offer us, we are able to proclaim our malady and our fall "happy."[8]

Thus are all the divine attributes manifested and exercised in perfect harmony; God does not demean Himself, and He is glorified; man does not die, and yet undergoes the merited punishment; infinite majesty condescends to infinite humiliation without derogating from its dignity; essential holiness sympathizes with extreme wretchedness without leaving the lightest fault unexpiated; the Invisible can accommodate Himself to the perceptions of His creatures; the Immense and the Eternal to space and time. . . .

[1] Luc. ii. 14. [2] Ps. lxxxiv. 11.

[3] In hoc apparuit charitas Dei in nobis quoniam Filium suum unigenitum misit Deus in mundum, ut vivamus per eum. 1 Joan. iv. 9.

[4] Rom. viii. 32. [5] Joan. iii. 16. [6] I Joan. iv. 8. [7] I Joan. iv. 16.

[8] O felix culpa quæ talem ac tantum meruit habere redemptorem. *Liturg.*

Sin is a work of disorder, folly, injustice, darkness, death; the Incarnation, which is to be followed by Redemption, is a work of heavenly harmony, transcendant wisdom, justice, light and resurrection. Sin brought us down lower than the brutes, the Incarnation raises us up even to God.

Some striking analogies may be observed between the regeneration of the world and its first creation. After five days of waiting, of preparation, of preliminary creations, the first Adam is made "from the slime of the earth, and earthly."[1] In him two different substances, the one properly belonging to angels, the other to animals, mind and body, are united in one human person. He is appointed master and lord of all the creatures that people the air, the earth and the waters. Afterwards this creation of the head of human nature is finished and completed, by the formation of Eve, drawn from his bosom; and by this addition humanity is created, lives, perpetuates itself, and with itself perpetuates also its misery and its destitution. In the same way, after a series of five thousand years, (according to the Septuagint,) and "with the Lord a thousand years is as one day,"[2] after these five great days devoted to the announcement, the figures, the preparations, and preliminaries of His arrival, the new Adam appears, "come down from heaven and heavenly."[3] In him also two natures, the divine nature itself and the human are joined together in the one person of the Word. He is appointed King of angels and of men. Afterwards His Incarnation in a certain sense is finished, completed, carried out in its fulness, by the formation of the Church, His Spouse, who is drawn from His Side, opened for us on the cross; and by the incorporation of the faithful into Jesus Christ in the bosom of His church, christianity is complete, it lives, it grows, it gives life to earth and peoples heaven!

[1] De terra terrenus. 1 *Cor.* xv. 47.
[2] Ps. lxxxix. 4. [3] De cælo cælestis. 1 *Cor.* xv. 47.

Moreover, heaven and earth concur in preparing for the Incarnation.

On the side of heaven I see a solemn *promise* made immediately after the Fall, and renewed to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, to Moses. In order to perpetuate this promise and to represent its fulfilment, a *Priesthood* and *Sacrifice* are instituted by the Most High; one family is rescued from the universal wreck; the God of all mankind makes a *covenant* with the people destined to be the parent of the Messiah; a law is given to this chosen race; inspired books are written for it; figurative sacrifices and a ritual are prescribed, every part of which foreshadows the Incarnation and Redemption; lastly, throughout the whole world, God disposes the course of events and the revolutions of empires with a view to the accomplishment of His designs. The Jews are diffused far and wide, having their sacred books translated into what was then the universal language; the Roman empire is extended beyond measure, and throughout its whole extent, contrary to all that could have been anticipated, peace prevails; the Roman roads have been constructed for the Apostles, &c., &c.

On earth and on the part of man, I hear on the one side, the prayers and sighs of patriarchs and prophets, calling for the *Desired of all nations*, entreating the clouds to rain down the Just: on the other, in the heathen world tyrannized over by the infernal powers, I behold an extreme necessity, miseries and follies which call for the Redeemer, who was promised to the world, more loudly than even the prayers of the saints. *Idolatry*, that senseless adoration of God under the likeness of men, of plants, of animals; idolatry, which in reality is but a counterfeit and monstrous incarnation, making all crimes divine; a sacriligious anticipation and an infernal caricature of the Christian Incarnation, comes to testify how necessary that incarnation is for poor human nature. In all times and in all places, both among Jews and Gentiles, I behold a

universal expectation and hope; in all times and in all places multiplied sacrifices inscribe in characters of blood on every altar, the necessity of the immolation of Calvary in order to our salvation. "He will come from the East," said the Greeks and Romans; "from the West," said the Indians and Chinese; "He will bring back the golden age and a new order of things," was the song of Virgil. "He will give the chief authority in the world to persons sent forth from Judea," wrote Tacitus. "In order to his being able to remedy all our ills it is necessary that he be God," was the thought of Plato. Meanwhile the genius of error and of evil having displayed its whole power, the age—an age at once the most enlightened and the most superstitious, the most polished and the most degraded, most worthy of the pity of heaven alike by its grandeur and by the exceeding greatness of its evils,—the age being at the highest point of glory and the last degree of decrepitude, the world being in extremities; He who had conversed with Adam and animated the paradise of pleasure by His sensible presence; who had spoken with Abraham so desirous to *see His day appear*;[1] who had discoursed familiarly with Moses and given forth His oracles in the midst of Israel, He, "the Word, was made flesh:" *Verbum caro factum est.* Emmanuel appears: a second creation of an order infinitely superior to the first, is effected in the universe. By the first, flesh had been united to spirit; by the second, flesh and spirit are united to God. By the first, the earth had had a mortal and fallible master, soon vanquished by his enemy; by the second it has a king who cannot be deceived, who cannot sin nor die, who is victorious over all the powers of hell. By the first creation, if the grace of the Incarnate Word had not raised him to a higher destiny, man could have attained to nothing higher than a natural end, and have seen God only in the mirror of creatures; by his regenera-

[1] Abraham exultavit ut videret diem meum, vidit et gavisus est. *Joan.* viii. 56.

tion he is predestined to see God as He is, face to face, in the splendors of the light divine. In the history of the first creation it is said, that the elementary light produced at the beginning and diffused through all nature, was on the fourth day concentrated in the sun, which thenceforward became, as it were, its focus or spring: so, as the Cardinal de Bérulle remarks, the uncreated light "which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world," and which diffused its beams even amid the darkness that repelled it, appeared at the end of the fourth millenium of the world, beaming forth in Jesus Christ, the true Sun of Justice, the source and focus of light and warmth and life for the world.

Thus from the very beginning of time was the coming of Emmanuel prepared.

He comes then in our flesh: man, to restore to God our humanity which sin had withdrawn from Him; man, pure, innocent, spotless, so that He has no satisfaction to make for Himself; man, enjoying from the first moment of His existence the vision and possession of God, so that He has not to merit eternal blessedness on His own account, at the cost of His sufferings and His death; He comes, in fine, Man-God: for, in order to repurchase for us God whom we had lost, it is necessary that He furnish a price equal to God; it is therefore necessary that He be God. In order to repair the infinite injury done to God by sin, it is necessary that He offer to God an expiation equal to God Himself, an infinite satisfaction; it is therefore necessary that He be God; and since He has to offer our humanity in sacrifice, it is necessary that He be Lord and Master of it, and, consequently, that He be God.

The principal data of the mystery of the Incarnation are thus presented by the creed of Nice, which was recited by the Council of Trent in its third session.

"I believe in one God the Father Almighty . . . . . And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God,

Light of Light, true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial with the Father, by Whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried. And the third day He rose again according to the scriptures; He ascended into heaven; sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and He is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead; of Whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; Who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified." . . . .

The Creed of St. Athanasius develops the Catholic doctrine in the following terms:

. . . "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and man:

"He is God of the substance of His Father, begotten before the world; and He is man of the substance of His mother, born in the world:

"Perfect God and perfect man; subsisting of a rational soul and human body:

"Equal to the Father according to His Godhead, and less than the Father according to His manhood:

"Who, although He be both God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ:

"One, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by the taking of the manhood unto God:

"One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person:

"For as the reasonable soul and the body is one man, so God and man is but one Christ:

"Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead:

"He ascended into heaven: He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall

come to judge the living and the dead: * * * * *

"This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully and steadfastly, he cannot be saved."

II.

Testimony of Jesus Christ, or of the Son of God in favor of His Divinity.

But what witnesses can give a suitable attestation to truths at once so mysterious and so important? There are three such witnesses, and we shall now hear them.

The first of the three is Jesus Christ Himself. He has declared, and that in the most formal manner, that the nature, the attributes, the operations, the titles, the prerogatives, the names of the Deity belong to Him.

First, *the nature*, "I and the Father are one."[1] "I am in the Father, and the Father in me."[2] "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine."[3] "He that seeth me seeth the Father."[4] Therefore when He says He is the Son of God, He means Son of God by nature, consubstantial wth His Father. Accordingly He calls Himself "the only begotten Son,"[5] and says that His Father is His own special Father.[6]

The *attributes* and *operations* of the Deity belong to Him: *Eternity:* "Before Abraham was made, I am."[7] "I am with you always till the end of time."[8] *Immensity:* He is, He says, the Son of man that descended from heaven, who nevertheless is in heaven."[9] Where two or three are gathered in His name, there He is in the midst of them.[10] *Omnipotence:* "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth."[11] *The power of remitting sins:* "Know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins."[12] He

[1] Joan. x. 30. [2] Joan. xiv. 10. [3] Joan. xvi. 15.
[4] Joan. xiv. 9. [5] Joan. iii. 16.
[6] Joan. v. 18. (ἴδιον) in the Greek. [7] Joan. viii. 58.
[8] Matth. xxviii. 20. [9] Joan. iii. 13. [10] Matth. xviii. 20.
[11] Matth. xxviii. 18. [12] Matth. xxviii. 9. 6.

gives grace and eternal life.[1] He grants the prayers that are addressed to Him, and Himself does that which we ask of the Father in His name.[2] He is the Resurrection and the Life:[3] the Way, the Truth, and the Life.[4] He lays down His human life of Himself; no one takes it from Him.[5] The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, is sent by Him, and the Spirit receives of or proceeds from Him.[6] He is also Lord of the Sabbath,[7] and in virtue of His power over the Lord's Day, He transfers it from one day to another. He is also the Lord of the Temple, which is *His house* no less than His Father's.[8] In a word, "what things soever the Father doth, these the Son also doth in like manner."[9]

He ascribes to Himself the *titles*, the *prerogatives*, the *names* of the Deity. He wishes that we should believe in Him, as we believe in God.[10] He would be the object of our most entire confidence, of our most absolute love.[11] He wills that we believe His word, receive His Baptism, obey His commands, and all this under pain of damnation. He announces that He Himself is to judge the world, that all men may honor the Son as they honor the Father.[12] He applies to Himself different prophecies, which attribute to God such and such miracles,[13] &c., &c.

But was this testimony clearly understood? It was understood alike by the friends of Jesus and by His enemies, by the learned and by the simple, by the magistrates as by the people, and that in the sense which we ourselves give to it, namely, its obvious and literal sense. The Jews wish to stone Him, because being a man, as they suppose, He makes Himself God.[14] "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the living God?" is the question of Caiphas.

[1] Joan. x. 28. [2] Joan. xiv. 13. [3] Joan. xi. 25.
[4] Joan. xiv. 6. [5] Joan. x. 18. [6] Joan. xvi. 14.
[7] Matth. xii. 8. [8] Joan. ii. 16; Matth. xxi. 13.
[9] Joan. v. 19. [10] Joan. xiv. 1. [11] Matth. x. 37.
[12] Joan. v. 23.
[13] Compare, for example, Isai. xxxv. 4 with Matth. xi. 4.
[14] Joan. x. 33.

Jesus answers, "I am." On which Caiphas cries out that He blasphemes, and they all pronounce him to be worthy of death.[1] At the moment when he expires, the centurion, the executioners who have crucified Him exclaim; "Indeed this was the Son of God."[2] What is the opinion of His disciples? Peter says to Jesus, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;"[3] and at a late period he reproaches the Jews; "You have killed the Author of life."[4] Thomas, falling at the feet of his good Master, exclaims; "My Lord and my God!"[5] and Jesus, in approval of his confession, replies: "Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed." St. John, both in his Gospel and his Epistles reminds us unceasingly, in varied forms of expression, of that great truth with which he opens his gospel: "The Word was God, and was made flesh, and dwelt among us."[6] At the sight of Mary, St. Elisabeth could not restrain her transports: "Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should come unto me?"[7] The dying Stephen testifies in his turn: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit; Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."[8] St. Paul calls Him: God manifested in the flesh;[9] God blessed for ever;[10] equal to God;[11] the great God;"[12]—proclaims that He is "yesterday and to-day, and the same for ever,"[13]—and attributes to Him "unchangeableness,[14] omnipotence, creation."[15] St. Jude stigmatizes those heretics who "make the grace of our Lord God" a pretext for their licentiousness, and deny "the only Sovereign Ruler and our Lord Jesus Christ."[16]

The testimony then which Jesus Christ gives of His divinity is very clear and very intelligible. Besides, it is *uniform* and *consistent.* From the period of His birth, Elisabeth, Zachary, Simeon, Anna, proclaim that He is

[1] Marc. xiv. 61, etc. [2] Matth. xxvii. 54. [3] Matth. xvi. 16.
[4] Act. iii. 15. [5] Joan. xx. 28. [6] Joan. i. 14.
[7] Luc. i. 43. [8] Act. vii. 59. [9] 1 Tim. iii. 16.
[10] Rom. ix. 5. [11] Philip. ii. 6. [12] Tit. ii. 13.
[13] Heb. xiii. 8. [14] Heb. i. 10. [15] Coloss. i. 16.
[16] Juda. 4.

God the Saviour, expected during four thousand years.[1] When He is twelve years old, Jesus declares in the temple, in presence of Joseph and Mary, that His true Father, whose work ought to be His first and His whole concern, is in heaven.[2] At thirty years of age, He begins His preaching, performs His first miracle, and elicits from His disciples a belief in His divinity.[3] Even unto His very last sigh He affirms that He is the immortal God, creator of the world, the resurrection and the life of humanity. He dies for having declared this great truth before prejudiced judges. After His resurrection, as He has proved by this decisive evidence the truth of His words, He speaks with more authority than before, as the Lord, the Saviour, the Master, and soon to be the Judge of every creature.

The testimony of Jesus is *calm* and tranquil in its assurance. Nothing could be more moderate, more gentle, farther removed from passion, vehemence, and enthusiastic excitement than His character. His language is as simple as it is sublime; His heart is meek and humble; His whole conduct breathes peace, patience, abnegation of self, the purest and most devoted love of God and man.

But it is important above all to observe to what a degree this testimony of the Redeemer is *disinterested*. At the same time that He demands for Himself all that is due to God—faith, hope, love—He refuses, He rejects with a kind of horror all that man would be ambitious of for himself. Riches He treads under foot, and has not whereon to lay His head; honors He repudiates, and retires when they wish to proclaim Him king; pleasures He ignores, and seeks nothing eagerly but sufferings. While on earth, He does not willingly accept any other

[1] Propheta Altissimi vocaberis. Unde hoc mihi ut veniat mater Domini mei ad me? Lucem ad revelationem gentium, etc. *Luc.* i. *and* ii.

[2] Luc. ii. 49.

[3] Joan, ii. 14.

portion of His acknowledged Divinity than the humiliations and agonies of His bloody sacrifice. For thus He reasons: Because I am Man-God, it is my will and my duty, to be the Saviour of mankind by the sacrifice of my humanity; I ought therefore to be poor, to be humiliated, to suffer and to die. So must it needs be. *Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and so enter into His glory.*[1] This idea of a Man-God, who precisely because of His divine mission, instead of receiving honors is to drain the cup of ignominy and disgrace; instead of accumulating wealth, to live in destitution; instead of enjoying this life's pleasures, is to endure agonies and to die, —this idea, it must be admitted, was not of a kind to tempt ordinary mortals. It is evident that Jesus Christ made any pretensions like His own, unapproachable to a mere man, by taking a cross as the throne of His divinity, a crown of thorns as His aureole of glory, a reed as His sceptre, blows and insults for His offerings, and making the principal act of His Divine Priesthood the sacrifice of His human nature. Better a thousand times in this present life to be purely and simply man, than to be God at such a cost as this; and, in the life to come, one who has said that he was God when he was not really so, has no other portion to anticipate than that of the most guilty among the reprobate. Thus Jesus Christ is not merely man; He is God, because the Man-God alone could have claimed divinity, under the new conditions which Jesus had made for it.

This is, what the Saviour Himself would have us observe, when He says: "Though I bear testimony of myself, my testimony is true, because I seek not my own glory, but the glory of Him that sent me."[2] Man, in fact, speaks either in his own interest or in an interest

[1] Luc. xxiv. 26.

[2] Qui a semetipso loquitur gloriam propriam quærit, qui autem quærit gloriam ejus qui misit eum, hic verax est. *Joan.* vii. 18. Judicium meum justum est, quia non quæro gloriam meam, sed voluntatem ejus qui misit me. *Joan.* v. 30.

superior to his own, and then it is in the interest of God, the sovereign truth. When he speaks in his own interest he often deceives; when in the interest of God, he necessarily speaks the truth. Very frequently it is impossible to discern whether this or that individual, under such and such circumstances, speaks from a personal interest or out of love for truth: in the case in which we are concerned, however, it is impossible not to discern this with the most absolute certainty, as all the human interests of Christ were sacrificed by the generous ambition which impelled Him to die for our salvation.

The testimony of Jesus is thus proved to be *sincere* by its perfect disinterestedness. This sincerity, however, is sufficiently manifested by itself. No one can contest the principle that these assertions, I am an angel—I am a man—I am God—I am Man-God, enunciate facts to which consciousness is called to testify, facts respecting which the inward sense cannot be mistaken. No one can be a man or an angel without being conscious that he is a man or an angel, and if he is conscious that he is one, he is one in fact. There is not one among men on earth, or angels in heaven, who knows that he is man or angel except upon the testimony of that ever faithful sense which is called the inward sense. Accordingly, our reasoning must be this. Jesus Christ affirms that he is Man-God. But this he either affirms with knowledge of the fact, and then we must necessarily believe Him, or He affirms it without knowing it, and then he is either a deceiver or under some hallucination,—there is no medium. In spite of the feelings of repugnance which this dilemma must awaken in every heart, it is necessary to propose it to the Deists, the Socinians, and all those undecided men who have not yet taken their side on this fundamental question: Either Jesus Christ is an impostor . . . . . or insane . . . . . or God!

Impostor! but all humanity exclaims, history protests, the well known character of Jesus Christ rises against a

supposition, which is as absurd as it is blasphemous. The greatest enemies of Christianity account Jesus Christ a sage, a genius, a hero, a benefactor of mankind. Mahomet venerated Him as a great prophet; Marcus Aurelius wished to place Him among the gods; those of the Jews who did not believe in His divinity, thought He was Elias or Jeremias risen from the dead; the catechism of Geneva, stamped as it is with Arianism, still would have its followers render Him *reverence*, *confidence*, *love*, and even *submission*. Could an impostor have converted the world? Could an impostor have inspired the Gospel? founded the Church? Could an impostor, in the age of Augustus, have succeeded in making himself worshipped by the civilized world, and that adopting the very opposite of all the human means necessary for success in such an undertaking? Again, is such an undertaking really capable of being carried out? To pass one's self off for the only true God? . . . For a created being sent by God,—yes, that is conceivable. A divine mission is something so vague, so indefinite, that every body may lay claim to it, in a sense more or less extended. Has not a father a mission in regard to his children; a prince, in regard to his subjects? a man of science towards the multitude whom he enlightens? a conqueror in regard to the people whom he smites and chastises? In this sense Mahomet, Zoroaster, Confucius, Alexander, Attila, might have said that they were sent by God; and Herod, Barcochebas, Apollonius, professed to be Messiahs. But do we ever see, during the historic period of the world, a man, whose understanding at least was not utterly deranged, who gave himself out for the true God? who ascribed to himself the nature, the attributes, the operations, the titles, the prerogatives of Divinity?

Is it possible, with any greater show of probability, to suppose hallucination or madness?—Nay, these are horrors which hell itself could not utter. Would a madman have made the world wise? have written the Gospel? Ah,

would he not rather be considered a madman, and most justly so, in every country under the sun, who should dare to tax with madness the Divine Wisdom become incarnate! Notwithstanding the infernal audacity which characterizes impiety, still, if you would reduce it to ask forgiveness and to acknowledge the truth, at least by the homage of silence, you have but to press it with this dilemma, to which it can make no reply except by an act of Christian faith: Jesus Christ . . . . impostor or insane . . . . . or God!

III.

Testimony of the Father; or proof of the Divinity of the Saviour drawn from His miracles.

The testimony which Jesus Christ gives to Himself is evidently sincere and truthful; we have shown it to be so. Still, as this declaration of the Word made flesh has to fix the uncertainty of man regarding doctrines that are altogether above human reason, and concerning duties most difficult to nature: as it has to set against the violence of our passions, an embankment over which they cannot pass, and to render all the resistance of flesh and blood inexcusable alike for the present and the future,— it could not be surrounded by too many guarantees, be brought out too distinctly, or obtain too solemn a confirmation.

When Jesus Christ asserted His Divinity to the Jews, he already heard the first murmurs of those human passions gathering like a pack of noisy hounds in all ages and in all places, and saying, "Thou givest testimony of thyself; thy testimony is not true."[1] He heard the Pharisees, the doctors of the law, the counterfeit sages, the pretended philosophers of every age, say with a false appearance of candor: "The law requires the testimony

[1] Testimonium perhibes de teipso, testimonium tuum non est verum. *Joan.* viii. 13.

of two or three witnesses for the support of any man's assertions: produce them and we will believe Thee."[1]

Although these two witnesses are not necessary, Jesus Christ is willing and ready to produce them. They will be such as the nature and magnitude of the truths to be attested require. They will be such as no living man will ever be able to refuse, without pronouncing his own condemnation by the very act itself: *He who believeth not shall be condemned.* These two witnesses will, in the language of the law, *be above all exception.*

I shall not here adduce the testimony of philosophers or of sages: Jesus accepts not *human testimony.*[2] And what in fact do men, nay what do the angels themselves know, of the inner nature, the counsels, the personal actions of God? And who really knows this "Son of God," who is speaking to us, "except His Father?"[3]

The first of the two witnesses then shall be . . . THE FATHER.

The Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, speaks by His acts, that is to say, by His creations. This is His language best understood. So long indeed as He merely preserves from age to age what He had originally created, no one heeds it, no one mind seriously reflects on the divine gift. The sun rose this morning: eight hundred millions of men were expecting it; no one felt his attention roused, nor was one sinner converted by being struck at its appearing. But when the Father creates a new thing on the earth, and causes it to appear under circumstances, which determine the intention and the object of the phenomenon; when, for instance, over the cross of the Saviour, on the fourteenth day of the moon, and at full mid-day, He creates a thick darkness which covers the earth, then every man is astonished and terri-

[1] Scriptum est: In ore duorum vel trium testium stet omne verbum. *Matth.* xviii. 16.

[2] Ego ab hominibus testimonium non accipio. *Joan.* v. 34.

[3] Nemo novit Filium nisi Pater. *Matth.* xi. 27.

fied, and raising his eyes to heaven, says, with Saul, cast down to the ground on the Damascus road, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" and "returns" contrite and striking his breast.[1]

Those marvellous works which have a name in every language, ancient and modern, and which we call miracles, belong to this order of productions. They are called creations by the Prophet Jeremias.[2] They are the expression of the Father's omnipotence. "It is the Father who abides in me, who does these superhuman works,"[3] was said by Jesus Christ. It is then the Father who speaks to us by the voice of miracles.

The possibility of miracles is attested not by Scripture only, but by the very idea of God, from whom the great attribute of omnipotence is inseparable; by the thought of creation, the first and greatest of miracles, without which the existence of the universe is inexplicable; by the belief of all nations, who have admitted into their languages the word, *miracle*, in the sense of a divine operation departing from the laws of nature. Neither Jews nor Pagans contested the possibility of a miracle; "why should it be thought a thing incredible by you," said St. Paul to King Agrippa, "that God should raise the dead?"[4]

That a proved miracle is a ground of faith, is no longer doubtful. The idea of God, we said at the beginning of our work, is the idea of the Infinite Being, exercising over every one of His creatures a supreme authority, to which the most prompt obedience is due so soon as its command is known. Now in a miracle, to which this significance is always attached, "I, the Lord, in order to obtain your belief in My Revelation, your obedience to My Law, thus affix the seal of My Omnipotence to the

[1] Percutientes pectora sua revertebantur. Luc. xxiii. 48.

[2] Creavit Deus novum super terram. *Jerem.* xxxi. 22.

[3] Pater in me manens ipse facit opera. *Joan.* xiv. 10.

[4] Quid incredibile judicatur apud vos si Deus mortuos suscitat? *Act* xxvi. 8.

words which you have heard,"—God's authority is seen in actual exercise; man therefore has only to adore and to obey. If he hesitate, he implies either that God is not speaking, which would be false, since there is an evident miracle; or that we may disregard the authority of God when He speaks, which is not only false but impious.

We may now listen to the voice of the Father with suitable docility. That voice sounds from one extremity of the universe to the other, and from the first hour, that followed the fall of man till the hour of final doom. It is loud and distinct, like the voice which promulgated the law from the top of Sinai, like the trumpet of the judgment day, sounding over the world reduced to ashes; it re-echoes with a thousand variations those words which were heard from heaven at the baptism and transfiguration of Jesus Christ, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye Him."

It is impossible to repeat this divine testimony in its entirety. We should have to review the whole history of the world, and especially the history of the people of God, of Jesus Christ, and of His Church. We will confine ourselves to a few.

There is a numerous race which has existed for four thousand years, and, which during a long period inhabited the most beautiful country in the world, that region washed by two seas, lying on the confines of Asia, Europe and Africa, and forming the connecting link between them. For the last eighteen centuries this people have been wandering, dispersed over the whole surface of the globe, without a country, without rulers, without a priesthood, without altars; unable to re-assemble, or to rebuild their temple, notwithstanding repeated efforts, and the assistance of numerous and powerful auxiliaries; and equally unable to mingle with other nations. A nation everywhere throughout the world hated, despised, repelled, persecuted, yet everywhere surviving the revolutions and the ruin of nationalities; telling in every land the tale of

its heavenly origin, its ancient glory, its unparalleled miseries, showing its history written in its sacred books, the most ancient, most authentic, most undoubtedly truthful of all books,—books the infallibility of which is attested by all the discoveries of science, by all the primitive traditions, by all the monuments of antiquity, by the extreme care which this nation has at all times taken to engrave and to perpetuate in its laws, its usages, its sacrifices, its festivals, nay, in its very flesh, the memories of the past. Well! Does not this people, the Jewish race, living thus under conditions altogether exceptional, in opposition to the laws which govern all other peoples,—exist in the world as a real creation of the power and justice of God, as a living miracle, eminently suited to make us believe the miracles of which its history is full, and which it attests with so much unanimity and constancy, and it must be added, with so much disinterestedness, since they all turn to its own condemnation!

The Hebrew people was destined to be the parent of the Messiah. To recompense the heroism of Abraham's sacrifice, God had said to him: "I will make thee the Father of a people more numerous than the stars of heaven, or the sand that is by the seashore; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."[1] Its history is divided into two periods, both of which, though differently, bear testimony to the Man-God. Since the death of Jesus Christ, the dispersion and the miseries of this ungrateful race, which had been distinctly foretold by the prophets,[2] have attested that it is enduring the chastisement of some great crime.

Before His advent a multitude of prodigies were wrought with a view to the Messiah, in order to prepare the minds of men to recognize him, and to provide, as it were, a description of Him for the generations to come. These prodigies kept alive the universal hope and proclaimed in advance His titles and His glory. That rock

[1] Genes. xxii. 17, 18. [2] Dan. ix. 26, 27.

which became a spring of living water in the wilderness, and of which the Apostle has said, that it was a figure of Christ,[1] is but one of a thousand similar facts that might be cited. The beloved Isaac, sacrificed by his father and surviving his immolation; that high priest of the Lord, Melchisedech, offering in sacrifice bread and wine; Joseph sold by his brethren and becoming the saviour of those brethren; Moses leading the Hebrews to freedom through the waves of the opening sea; Joshua introducing the people of God into the promised land, and overthrowing the walls of Jericho by the sound of the trumpets; Gideon vanquishing the innumerable armies of God's enemies by his faith and obedience; the tabernacle which gave forth the oracles; the immolated lamb whose blood turned aside the sword of the destroying angel; the brazen serpent, the sight of which restored health to the dying; the wood that sweetened the bitter waters; David overthrowing with one cast of his sling the Philistine giant; Solomon building the temple of the true God; Jonah swallowed up by a monster of the sea, and the third day deposited alive upon the shore; Daniel taken alive and unhurt from the den of the lions; the great prophet Elias who fasts forty days in the wilderness, and governs nature as its master,—all the history of Israel, its whole law—was Christ. "Christ is the end of the law,"[2] St. Paul says again. Everything in the law is directed towards and issues in Jesus Christ, all speaks of Him and for Him, all testifies to His divine mission, His heavenly origin, His invincible power, let us say in one word, His divinity.

And now He appears. At the very time that He, the voluntary victim of our pride, our love of riches, our sensuality, is humbling Himself, becoming poor, and devoting Himself to all possible sufferings, the angels are celebrating His coming, and singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth to men of good-will;" a star reveals Him to the Magi; the heavenly hosts to the

[1] Petra autem erat Christus. 1 *Cor.* x. 4. [2] Rom. x. 4.

shepherds; His mother unites to the happiness of divine maternity, the glory of angelic virginity; Simeon, Anna, Elisabeth, Zachary, learn by a supernatural light, His future destinies.

Jesus retires into the desert; by the severity of His fast He shows that He is of a nature superior to ours; the angels, as soon as He allows them, hasten to minister to Him.

He comes forth from His retreat; at the request of His mother, He performs His first miracle at the marriage at Cana, and thenceforward His disciples believe in His divinity.

Listen to the words in which He himself recounts the fruits of His ministry to the disciples of John the Baptist: "The blind see, the deaf hear, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the dead raised, the poor have the gospel preached to them."

His enemies, for truth and virtue must ever meet with implacable adversaries in the passions and prejudices of mankind, His enemies threaten and pursue Him; Jesus reads their hearts, makes Himself invisible to them, or casts them to the ground by a glance.

Attacked by the storm, He commands the waves and they are still; He walks upon the waters, He orders them to become firm under the steps of His disciples, and at His call Peter walks upon the surface of the deep.

On Thabor He foretells His approaching humiliations, sufferings and death; at the same time, however, His countenance is beaming with the brightness of the sun, His garments are radiant with a splendor unknown to mortals, Moses appears on His right, Elias on His left, and His disciples, believing that they are transported to Heaven, ask that they may fix their tents for ever on that holy mountain.

In the garden of Gethsemane He yields up His heart to heaviness, fear and sadness; His blood streams upon the ground, but an angel comes down from heaven to

strengthen Him; one word from His lips prostrates a whole cohort, and while allowing Himself to be bound He bids them leave His Apostles free, and He is obeyed.

He ascends the cross, there to offer up His humanity in sacrifice. the victim of our sins; but the sun is veiled in horror, the earth trembles to its foundations, the rocks are rent, the veil of the temple is torn asunder, the graves are opened,—His very executioners, when they see Him die, recognize and proclaim that He is God!

Jesus has breathed forth His last sigh; His tomb, hewn in the rock, is watched by Roman soldiers, that strongest of all guards, and secured by the most sacred seals, those of the Synagogue; . . . And meanwhile Jesus is free among the dead; He knows and He takes again the road to life; and whilst His angel rolls back the stone, breaks the seals, terrifies the guard, He shows Himself to His apostles; He appears to His disciples, to more than five hundred witnesses assembled in one place, allowing Himself to be seen, heard and touched; conversing and eating with them, in Judea, in Galilee, in the Supper-room, on the sea shore, on the mount of Olives,—and all during forty consecutive days.

Thus does the omnipotence of the Father in His well beloved Son perform works which *no other man hath done;*[1] miracles which the Jews declare they cannot dispute; "they are manifest," as they said of those of the Apostles, "and we cannot deny them."[2] His enemies attribute them to an infernal power, but do not attempt to question their reality. As very many persons had been converted at the sight of Lazarus raised from the dead, they conceive the ridiculous and barbarous project of putting him to death, in order to destroy this living evidence of the omnipotence of Jesus; but to ignore, to deny this resurrection, is impossible even for them; *Manifestum est, et*

[1] Opera quæ nemo alius fecit. *Joan.* xv. 24

[2] Manifestum est et non possumus negare. *Act.* iv. 16. See *Joan.* xi. 47.

non possumus negare. In the same way, at a later period, the heads of the synagogue will forbid the Apostles to preach the resurrection of Jesus under pain of death; but they will never dare to order an inquiry against them, to attempt to demonstrate the falsehood of their story. Against the solemn affirmation of the Apostles, of the disciples, of hundreds of consistent, disinterested witnesses, ready to seal their testimony with their blood, all that they allege is a dream: yes, a dream, the dream of those sleepers who awoke to tell us: *The disciples came while we were asleep.*[1] Herod, the most wicked and impious of the Jews, is so convinced that miracles everywhere attend the steps of Jesus, that he is glad to see Him brought into his presence, believing He will at once perform some great prodigy.[2] Tertullian said to the Jews: "You do not yourselves deny that Christ wrought these miracles."[3] St. Justin appealed to the public registers or acts of the government of Pontius Pilate, existing even in his time, which mentioned the miraculous cures of Jesus.[4] Julian the apostate said to the Christians that Jesus had done no work worth mentioning, unless one thought the curing of the lame and the blind, and exorcising those who were possessed by demons, in the villages of Bethsaida and Bethany, were very great works." *It is manifest, and we cannot deny.*

The testimony of the Almighty Father, then, was heard at every memorable crisis of the life of Jesus, as at every period of the history of Israel, the parent, the precursor, and the type of Jesus. And this great voice was not to become silent after the triumphant ascension of the Saviour of mankind; it sounds forth in every age and under every sky, in the Church as well as in the Synagogue.

[1] *Matth.* xxviii. 13.

[2] Sperabit aliquod signum videre ab eo fieri. *Luc.* xxiii. 8.

[3] Hæc operatum Christum nec vos diffitemini. *Adv. Judæos.* c. ix.

[4] Apol. ii. [5] St. Cyril, *Contra Julian.* l. vi.

However, there is this difference to be noted in regard to the manifestation of miraculous power,—that the tree of the church, having taken root, will no longer need to be watered by this rain from heaven. This is the observation of St. Gregory:[1] and before him St. Paul had said that certain miraculous gifts were reserved for the conversion of unbelievers.[2]

The Son of God had foretold: He that believeth in me, the works that I do he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do.[3] And in another place: "These signs shall follow them that believe: In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents: and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover."[4]

If we would convince ourselves of the literal accomplishment of this prophecy, it is sufficient to trace the history of the church, that portion of it, especially, which was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and which we know by the name of the *Acts of the Apostles.*

That history may be summed up thus: The Holy Spirit is poured out upon the Apostles and disciples under the form of fiery tongues; they at once speak a language understood by people of all nations, and form a society which is one heart and one soul. Peter says to one who has been lame from his birth, as is well known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, "In the name of Jesus Christ, arise and walk;" and the lame man rises up, walks, and goes into the temple to give thanks to the Lord. Ananias and Sapphira expiate their lie to the Holy Ghost by an instantaneous death at the feet of the Prince of the Apostles. At another time the shadow of Peter cures the sick, who are brought in crowds from the neighboring towns and placed upon the way where he is to pass. The Apostles, when thrown into prison, are liberated by an

[1] *Hom.* xxix in *Evang.*
[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.
[3] Joan. xiv. 12.
[4] Matth. xvi. 18.

angel. Stephen, of whom it is recorded that he "did great wonders and signs among the people," appears in the presence of his persecutors with the countenance of an angel, and when dying exclaims: "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right of God." Philip in his missions is transported from place to place, by the Spirit of God. Saul is cast to the ground on his way to Damascus, at once dazzled and enlightened by Him whom he had so long persecuted. While grace is forming this persecutor to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, Peter is engaged visiting the Christian churches. At Lydda he cures a paralytic who had for eighteen years been confined to a bed of suffering, by these words: "Eneas, the Lord Jesus Christ healeth thee, arise!" At Joppa, he finds a church in desolation because of the death of a holy woman whose life had been full of good works: Peter says to her, Tabitha, arise: and Tabitha opens her eyes and sits up, and is restored to her family and her poor. At Cæsarea, Cornelius the Centurion is warned by an angel to seek his salvation in the words of Peter, and that Apostle meanwhile is instructed by a miraculous vision that the Gentiles in their turn are to enter into the church, and that no man who fears God and acts justly ought to be accounted unclean. While the Gentiles crowd into the church, the prophet Agabus predicts that the world will soon be afflicted by a severe famine; which affords an opportunity to the faithful to show the inexhaustible and marvellous resources of christian charity. To the famine is joined persecution. Herod puts St. James to death, and imprisons St. Peter, delaying his execution until after the feast of the Pasch: but the Angel of the Lord a second time comes to liberate the head of the church, and smites the persecutor, who dies eaten up by worms. While Peter, restored to his labors, continues to feed the lambs and the sheep which Jesus Christ had committed to him, Paul converts Sergius, the proconsul, by striking the impostor Elymas with blindness in his pres-

ence. At Lystra he enables a man who had been lame from his birth, to walk, a miracle which draws from the inhabitants that spontaneous and natural exclamation. "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men!" and the priest of the false gods prepares to offer sacrifice to the Apostle. At Ephesus, Paul works so many and wonderful miracles, that the linen and garments that he has worn, are sent to cure the sick at a distance, and the Jewish converts adopt in their adjurations, "the name of that *Jesus* whom Paul preaches." At Troas he restores to life the young man Eutychus, who having gone to sleep during the preaching (which was continued far into the night) had fallen from the third story and been taken up dead. During his voyage to Rome he foretells the storm, and obtains by his prayers the safety of his fellow passengers. At Malta he is bitten by a viper, yet remains unharmed, and the witnesses of this prodigy, who at first, on seeing that he had escaped from shipwreck only to be bitten by a serpent, suspected that he was some great criminal, now cry out, he is a god!—a new evidence that miracles are everywhere regarded as the voice and the seal of the Deity. The same great Apostle, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, devotes three chapters to tracing the rules which should be observed in order to make the miraculous gifts then common among the faithful serve for the edification of the Church.

In the ages succeeding the Apostolic, St. Justin in his *Apology for Christianity*,[1] St. Irenæus,[2] Origen,[3] Lactantius,[4] St. Cyprian,[5] St. Jerome,[6] St. Athanasius,[7] bring forward as a fact publicly known and incontestible, and which they themselves frequently witness, that the demons

[1] *Apol.* ii. n. 6. *Dial cum Triph.* n. 30, and passim.
[2] Iren. lib. ii. c. 32. Cont. Hæres.
[3] *Hom. in lib. Reg.* i. n. 14. *In Cels.* lib. i. n. 2, and in many other places.
[4] Inst. lib. ii. c. 15; iv. 27, v. 21.
[5] *Ad Demetrianum*, and *Epist. adv. Donat.*
[6] *Epist.* 44 *ad Marcell.* [7] Lib. *de Incarn.*

are driven out, the sick cured, the dead raised to life, by the name of Jesus Christ. Tertullian defies the pagans to produce one possessed person who can not be freed from demoniac power by the name of Jesus, and calls on themselves to testify to the truth of his words.[1] In fact the early enemies of the Church did not deny the miraculous gifts accorded to her: Celsus formally acknowledged them: but, as the Jews had done in regard to the Redeemer's, they attributed these miracles to the invocation of demons.[2]

For many centuries the church has made it a rule to propose for public veneration those saints only whose faith and virtue God has rewarded by proved miracles; and when engaged in ascertaining the truth of such miracles, she employs precautions, delays, examinations, and in short all the methods of proceeding which the severest criticism could demand.[3] The *Acts of the Saints* therefore are a worthy continuation of the *Acts of the Apostles;* and several of these miraculous facts belong to contemporary history. Who has not read the charming account of the conversion of that young Israelite, suddenly enlightened, and sanctified by a heavenly apparition in the church of St. Andrew *delle frtte?* "At this gesture of the Mother of God," says M. de Ratisbonne, "the bandage fell from my eyes; not one bandage only, but the multitude of bandages, which had before enveloped me, rapidly and successively disappeared, like ice under the bright sunshine. I was as a man awaking from a deep slumber, as one born blind, who all at once beholds the light. At last I seized the medal which I had allowed to remain on my breast. I kissed in tears the image of the Virgin radiant in grace.—Oh; it was she undoubtedly that I had seen!"

Thus in our own days as in those when Jesus cured

[1] *Apol.* from c. xxi. to c. xxv. [2] Orig. *in Cels.* l. i. c. 1.

[3] See the rules drawn out by Benedict xiv, in his work, *De Canonizatione Sanctorum.*

the man born blind, and in those when His Apostles wrought wonders in His name; under the mild European sky as under the burning sun of Africa and Asia, the Father repeats his solemn testimony: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye Him." Hear Him, for after so many miracles wrought in evidence of His mission your unbelief would be without excuse.[1] Hear Him:—inanimate nature obeys Him: how shall that creature whom He has endowed with free will dare to disobey Him? Hear Him: it is manifest that He is the Word of the Father, since by His instrumentality the Father, the Almighty Creator, speaks in a language properly His own—the language of Miracles: *Ipsum audite.*

IV.

Testimony of the Holy Ghost; or proofs of the Divinity of Jesus Christ derived from the fulfilment of the Prophecies, and the conversion of the world in the time of the Apostles.

We have heard the testimony of the first witness whom Jesus calls to support His claims: but to establish the truth of any fact, the law requires two witnesses: *In ore duorum, &c.* A second witness then shall be produced, a second, equal to the first, of the same dignity, the same authority, the same merit: this can only be the Holy Ghost.

"The Holy Ghost," says the Nicene Creed, "inspired the Prophets and spoke by their mouths."[2] Now all the prophets do homage to the divinity of Jesus Christ, a homage to which He Himself appealed by saying to the Jews: "Search the scriptures; it is they that give testimony to me."[3] This same Divine Spirit was to be sent down to earth by the Lord Jesus, when He ascended again to heaven; and by converting the world to Christ-

[1] Joan. xv. 22. [2] Locutus est per Prophetas.

[3] Scrutamini Scripturas, ipsæ sunt quæ testimonium perhibent de me. *Joan.* v. 39.

ianity was to give testimony, in another and not less striking manner, to the Son of God. "When the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you, the Spirit of truth, He shall give testimony of me."[1] It is the testimony of this second witness which we are now about to hear.

Among other mental faculties tending to his preservation, man has been endowed by God with the gift of *presentiment*,—a feeling that anticipates those events and crises, those joys and sorrows which are soon to befall him, the germs of which are deposited in the past of his own life or that of the world. Thus the pain which an incurable infirmity causes me to-day, gives me a presentiment of what I shall experience to-morrow: the offence he has committed makes the culprit anticipate certain chastisement: From the colors of the evening sky we predict the weather of the ensuing day.

But as to events depending only on the will of God, in which there is absolutely nothing necessary, who can have a presentiment of these? Unquestionably He, and and He alone, can perceive and announce them, who carries their germs in the free determination of His own will.

The salvation of the world, by the shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ, was one of those events, in every respect supernatural of which the heart of God, the personal love and subsistent charity of God alone could have any certain presentiment, or could foretell to mortals.

Divine predictions of this kind are called *Prophecies;* and the instruments of the Holy Spirit, who at different periods have been the means of communicating them to the world, are called *Prophets.* The collection of these predictions forms, we may say, a fifth Gospel, not less clear and much more complete than any single book of the new Testament. Let us make some extracts from its pages.

Immediately after the fall, God promises to the first

[1] Joan. xv. 26.

man a descendant of Eve who shall crush the serpent's head;[1] to Abraham a child of his race by whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.[2] The same promise is renewed to Isaac and to Jacob.[3]

The patriarch Jacob tells his sons assembled round his death-bed that "the sceptre of authority shall not pass from Judah, that his descendants shall always give rulers to Israel, until the coming of Him who is to be sent, and who is to be the expectation of the nations."[4]

The prophet Nathan,[5] and at a later period Isaiah[6] and Jeremiah,[7] announce that the Messiah will be the son of Jesse and of David; and in the Psalms David himself sings the glories of that immortal son who would be given him through Solomon.[8] Lastly, Emmanuel, God dwelling with men, was to be the blessed son of a Virgin Mother.[9] Such, according to the prophets, is the genealogy of the Saviour: Son of the Virgin, of Solomon, of David, of Jesse, of Judah, of Jacob, of Isaac, of Abraham, of Adam. The intermediate links are given by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

But *when* is He to come, this Desired of all nations? When the sceptre passes away from Judah, is the answer of Jacob.[10] During the existence of the second temple, which He will fill with His glory, says Aggeus.[11] After seventy-two weeks (of years), reckoning from the order given to rebuild Jerusalem, says Daniel:[12] Under the fourth kingdom (the Roman empire) which, like iron was to break and to subdue all, he says again.[13] When His angel comes, who is to prepare the way before Him, says Malachi;[14] and Isaiah developing the same oracle: When the voice is heard in the desert crying: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight the paths which our God

[1] Genes. iii. 15. [2] Genes. xxii. 18.
[3] Genes. xxvi. 4, and xxviii. 14. [4] Genes. xlix. 10.
[5] 2 Reg. vii. 14 and 16; see ad Hebr. i. 5. [6] Is. xi. 1.
[7] Jerem. xxiii. 5. [8] Ps. lxxxviii. [9] Is. vii. 14.
[10] Genes. xlix. 10. [11] Agg ii. 7. [12] Dan. ix. 24.
[13] Dan. ii. [14] Mal. iii. 1.

shall tread . . . . Let every valley be filled up, and every height brought low.[1] When the Gentiles, a people sitting in the shadow of death, shall see a great light appear, Isaiah says again;[2] and when "a star shall rise upon Israel," is written by Moses.[3] The bringing together of all these dates indicated so clearly the very period of the Redeemer's coming, that no one could be mistaken in its approach. Accordingly the popular opinion was expressed with certainty: "we know that the Messiah is coming," were the words of the first comer and assuredly not the most devout among the women of Samaria.[4]

The place where He is to be born is likewise well known: "At Bethlehem," are the words of Micheus, "the least among a thousand of the cities of Judah. Out of thee shall come forth the ruler of Israel, whose generation is from the beginning, from the days of eternity."[5]

"He shall be called Saviour," announce Isaiah[6] and Zachariah:[7] Habacuc calls Him Jesus and Christ.[8] The Prophets give Him all the names employed to designate the Deity, even the incommunicable name of Jehovah.[9]

Here are some particulars of His infancy: "The Ethiopians," says David, "shall fall down before Him; the kings of Tharsis and the islands shall offer presents: the kings of the Arabians and of Saba shall bring gifts."[10] "They of Saba," says Isaias, "shall offer him gold and frankincence."[11] Jeremiah utters the mournful prophecy; "A voice shall be heard on high, of mourning and weeping, the voice of Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they are not."[12] But during the massacre of all these children, what becomes of the infant Son of Mary? "I called my Son out of Egypt," saith the Lord by Osee.[13]

[1] Is. xl. 3. [2] Is. ix. 2. [3] Num. xxiv. 17.
[4] Joan. iv. 25. [5] Mich. v. 2.
[6] Is. xii. 3; li. 5; lxii. 11; lxiii. 8. [7] Zach. ix. 9.
[8] Hab. iii. 13, 18. [9] Is. ix. 6; xii. 2; xi. 3, 10. Zach. xi. 13.
[10] Ps. lxxi. 9, 10. [11] Is. lx. 6. [12] Jerem. xxxi. 15.
[13] Osee. xi. 1.

His portrait is thus drawn by Isaias. "Behold my servant, I will help Him, my chosen one, in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my Spirit upon Him. He shall bring forth judgments to the nations. He shall not cry aloud nor have respect to persons, neither shall His voice be heard abroad. The bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax He shall not quench. He shall bring forth judgment in truth, He shall not be melancholy nor turbulent till he establish judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for His law."[1]

The history of His miracles is thus recounted by Isaias. "God Himself will come and will save you. Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free."[2]

David informs us of the method which He will follow in His teaching: "I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world."[3]

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion," exclaims the prophet Zacharias, "shout for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem: Behold thy King will come unto thee, the just and saviour: He is poor, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."[4]

Notwithstanding the good He has done and the enthusiasm attending on His triumph, the Saviour is betrayed by one of His own friends: David complains of it in these words: "If my enemy had reviled me, I would have borne with it; and if he that hailed me had spoken great things against me, I would perhaps have hid myself from him. But thou, a man of one mind, my guide and my familiar friend, who didst take sweet meats together with me; we walked with consent in the house of God."[5]

"And they weighed for me thirty pieces of silver," says Zacharias, "And the Lord said to me, cast it to the

[1] Is. lxxii. 1. Matth. xxii. 18. [2] Is. xxxv. 4.
[3] Ps. lxxvii. 2; Matth. xiii. 35. [4] Zach. ix. 9. [5] Ps. liv. 13.

statuary, (or potter) a handsome price that I was prized at by them: and I took the thirty pieces of silver, and I cast them into the house of the Lord to buy the potter's field."[1]

Sold for thirty pieces of silver, "the shepherd is struck, and the sheep are scattered."[2] What will then befall the Saviour? Hear how Isaias describes His sufferings: "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? He shall grow up as a tender plant before Him, and as a root out of a thirsty ground: there is no beauty in Him, nor comeliness: and we have seen Him and there was no sightliness that we should be desirous of Him. Despised, and the most abject of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with infirmity: and His look was as it were hidden and despised, whereupon we esteemed Him not. Surely he hath borne our infirmities, and carried our sorrows; and we have thought Him as it were a leper, and as one struck by God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our iniquities, He was bruised for our sins, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His bruises we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, every one hath turned aside into his own way: and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was offered because it was His own will, and He opened not His mouth: He shall be led as a sheep to the slaughter, and be dumb as a lamb before His shearer, and He shall not open His mouth."[3]

Let us listen next to the prophet David in the twenty-first Psalm, the first verse of which Jesus repeated when dying, to teach us that this prophecy was the truest picture of His feelings and of His sufferings during that agony: "My God, my God, look upon me: why hast Thou forsaken me? Thou art far from my salvation because of the voice of the sins I bear. ‖ O my God, I shall cry by day and Thou wilt not hear, and by night, and it shall not be reputed as folly in me: ‖ But Thou

[1] Zach. xi. 12; Matth. xxvii. 9. [2] Zach. xiii. 7. [3] Is. liii.

dwellest in the holy place, the praise of Israel. ‖ In Thee have our Fathers hoped, they have hoped, and Thou hast delivered them. ‖ They cried unto Thee, and were saved: they trusted in Thee, and were not confounded. ‖ But I am a worm and no man; the reproach of men, and the outcast of the people. ‖ All they that saw me have laughed me to scorn; they have spoken with the lips, and wagged the head. ‖ He hoped in the Lord, let Him deliver him; let Him save Him, if He delighteth in him. ‖ For Thou art He that hath drawn me out of the womb: my hope from the breasts of my mother: ‖ I was cast upon Thee from the womb. From my mother's womb thou art my God; depart not from me. ‖ For tribulation is very near: for there is none to help me. Fat bulls have besieged me, they have opened their mouth against me, as a lion ravening and roaring. ‖ I am poured out like water; and all my bones are out of joint. ‖ My heart is become like wax melting in the midst of my bowels. ‖ My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue hath cleaved to my jaws; and thou hast brought me down into the dust of death. ‖ For many dogs have encompassed me: the council of the malignant hath besieged me: They have dug through my hands and my feet: they have counted all my bones. ‖ And they have looked and stared upon me. They parted my garments amongst them; and upon my vesture they cast lots."[1] ‖ In another place the Prophet says: "They gave me gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink."[2]

But what are the events which will follow this great sacrifice? Daniel informs us: "After sixty-two weeks" (of years, such is the style of scripture) "Christ shall be slain; and the people that shall deny Him shall not be His. And a people with their leader that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary: and the end thereof shall be waste, and after the end of the war the appointed desolation. And He shall confirm the covenant

[1] Ps. xxi. 1-19. [2] Ps. lxviii. 23.

with many, in one week: and in the half (the middle) of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fail: and there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation: and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation, and to the end."[1]

Christ being put to death, "His sepulchre shall be glorious," saith Isaias.[2] "My flesh shall rest in hope," said the Lord by the royal prophet, "because Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; nor wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the way of life, Thou shalt fill me with joy with Thy countenance: at Thy right hand are delights for all eternity."[3]

We are obliged to pass over a multitude of other prophecies, bearing on the calling of the gentiles, the establishment of the kingdom of Christ, and of the eucharistic sacrifice; we will conclude with this beautiful picture of the Church, painted by Isaias: "There shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse . . . Then the wolf shall dwell with the lamb: and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: the calf of the lion and the sheep shall abide together, and a little child shall lead them. The heifer and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall rest together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox: And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp; and the weaned child shall thrust his hand into the den of the basilisk. They shall not hurt, nor shall they kill in all Thy holy mountain, for the earth is filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the covering waters of the sea. In that day the root of Jesse, who standeth for an ensign of the people, to Him shall the gentiles pray, and His sepulchre shall be glorious."[4]

Such is the brief sketch of the first testimony which the Holy Ghost has consigned to the records of revelation, and to which Jesus Christ appealed when He said to

[1] Dan. ix. 26, etc. [2] Is. xi. 10. [3] Ps. xv. 9.
[4] Is. xi. 6-10; Rom. xv. 12.

the Jews: "Search the scriptures: it is they that give testimony of Me."[1] He Himself, after His ressurrection, alleged this argument especially, in order to convince the dejected disciples on their road to Emmaus: "O foolish," He said, "and slow of heart to believe all which the prophets have spoken; was it not necessary that Christ should suffer these things, and so enter into His Glory. And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded to them in all the scriptures the things that concerned Himself."[2]

Let us not merit a like reproach. Let us understand all that there is imposing, solemn, glorious for Jesus Christ, obligatory for ourselves, in this testimony of the Holy Spirit, which all the prophets, diffused through Israel and through the whole world, have been re-echoing for four thousand years.

The dispensation of these precursors of the Messiah uttered its last oracles by the mouth of St. John the Baptist, who pointed out in person the Lamb of God laden with the sins of the world;[3] nevertheless, the Holy Ghost does not cease to bear witness to Jesus Christ. The Saviour of mankind had said, When the Paraclete cometh, the Spirit of truth, whom I will send unto you, He shall give testimony of me."[4] We will now see how this prophetic promise of the God-Man has been fulfilled.

To understand this testimony aright, we must first recognize the existence of a severe law which governs the moral world.

Abandoned to his natural powers alone, man declines and degenerates.

All history establishes this fact. From the creation of man to his fall; from the fall to the deluge, when all flesh had corrupted its ways, and God repented that He had created man; from the going out of the ark to the confu-

[1] Joan. v. 39. [2] Luc. xxiv. 25.
[3] Lex et Prophetæ usque ad Joanem. *Luc.* xvi. 16.
[4] Joan. xv. 25.

sion of Babel: and the rise of idolatry, war and slavery; from the time of Abraham until the day when God tore up the covenant which he had made with his people and scattered the broken residue of Israel over the whole world,—do we not behold humanity unceasingly declining and degenerating?

The existence of this hard law did not escape the notice either of philosophers or of poets. Poetry represented the human race as descending from the golden to the silver age, from the silver to the iron. *Ætas parentum*, says Horace, *pejor avis, tulit nos nequiores mox daturos progeniem vitiosorem.* It is evident that if vicious inclinations, like certain unhealthy dispositions of body, are propagated with the blood, then in proportion as the blood flows further from its source, does it become less pure. Again, the farther man is removed from the times and places where the Lord originally vouchsafed to communicate Himself to him, for example, from the earthly paradise, the more weak and evanescent becomes the impression of those celestial favors. And the more widely the domain of commerce, manufactures, and arts is extended the more will that threefold concupisence which is the great disease of man, find objects of gratification and means of extending its ravages. Lastly, the number of the diseased,—and all the offspring of Adam are diseased from their birth—enlarges with the population. Now every one knows that the intensity of a plague is in proportion to the number affected by it. Yes, such is the lamentable fact: the greater the number of sinners in the world the more are they led to excuse sin, to extenuate it, to justify it to their conscience, to yield themselves to it without remorse, to despair of recovery, nay, how many become delirious from the violence of their disorder, and in their wildness think disease is health, and health disease, call evil good, and good evil? This undoubtedly is the most fearful symptom of a mortal and incurable disease.

This fatal law being admitted, an unheard of phenomenon presents itself for elucidation. Starting from a day ever memorable, which we call the day of *Pentecost*, at a period when the Jewish nation was rejected, and its destruction close at hand—when the pagan world, under the rule of the infamous Tiberius, was in the agonies of dissolution—we behold a new people arise, as it were by enchantment, a people which soon spread over the whole world, and bore the name of the Christian people. In this people humanity rises to a height previously inaccessible. A multitude of virtues which had not even a name in the languages hitherto spoken by mankind, as humility, self-denial, mortification, charity become common qualities: acts of self devotion, unknown to both Jewish and pagan antiquity, poverty, chastity, voluntary obedience, are of daily occurrence in the Church. A society such as had never before been seen, and which a book inspired by heaven defines as *one heart* and *one soul*, is established far and wide through the influence only of persuasion and love. Marriage is pure, sacred, and, as it had only been in the earliest days of the world, indissoluble; idols fall; oracles become dumb; the temples of the false gods are transformed into holy sanctuaries: the slave is set free, the infant brought up, woman restored to her rightful dignity; the laws are reformed; innumerable asylums are opened throughout the world for the relief of every form of distress; a multitude of schools diffuse over the earth the knowledge of the true God. Before this time He was feared, now He is loved; and fourteen millions of martyrs think it a happiness to die for Him. What then is this miracle, which, substitutes for a law of degeneration too clearly apparent, an entirely opposite law, the law of progress? This miracle in itself the greatest, the most healthgiving of all; "that which," in the words of St. Augustine, "might well supply the place of all others."[1]

[1] Aug. de civ. Dei. xxii. 5 and 8.

Whence comes it, that dating from the fiftieth day after the Resurrection of the Redeemer, humanity, as existing in that multitude of believers, which it supplies to the church, instead of falling, rises; instead of sinking lower, ascends, as the waters of Jordan hastened to mount towards their source at the approach of the Ark?—while races who have refused to be christian, or have ceased to be so, continue to follow the downward tendency which draws them on to barbarism? What name must we give to the new spirit which has been poured out upon the world? That spirit which makes us love God as a Father and all mankind as brethren, and even leads us to prize humiliations, crosses, martyrdom, as assured pledges of heavenly happiness? That spirit of *purity*, which shrinks with horror from the slightest stain, and makes virginity so honorable and so frequent? That spirit of *charity*, which induces us to welcome and tend every one who is in misfortune, as if he were Jesus Christ Himself? That spirit of *freedom*, which delivers us from the bondage of evil passions, and does not allow us to acknowledge any superior on earth except our heavenly Father, represented in the family and in society by those who truly bear His commission? That spirit of *zeal* and *self-devotion*, which makes itself all things to all, that it may gain all for Jesus Christ? That spirit of *gentleness* and of *force*, of *prudence* and *simplicity;* that spirit of *humility* amid the highest merits; of *constancy* amid incessant persecutions; that spirit of *lofty science* and *docile faith*, which subdues the world and searches the very depths of God, which warms and inflames as much as it enlightens; which forms at once the happiness and the perfection of the Christian. . . . This spirit evidently is not the spirit of man. . . . Since the fall the spirit of man has been selfish, proud, pusillanimous, impure. . . . Still less is it the spirit of Satan, which could only lead to evil. . . . It is therefore the Spirit of God, the Spirit promised and sent by Jesus Christ, *the Holy Spirit.*

Now, this Spirit leads us to place our confidence and our love in Jesus Christ, to observe His laws, to imitate His example, to believe His Gospel, to hope for salvation from the merits of His redemption, to pray for His grace in order to attain to His glory; in a word, to invest Him with all the honors which are due to the Deity.

This Spirit proclaims Him as God by the mouth of all the martyrs; of St. Felicitas, of St. Justin, of St. Epipodius, of St. Peter of Lampsacus, etc.[1] By the mouth of all the Fathers and all the Pontiffs; of St. Barnabas, who calls Christ "the Son of God manifest in the flesh;"[2] of St. Ignatius, who calls Him "our God" and "God born in flesh;"[3] of St. Polycarp, who invokes Him as "the eternal Son of God;"[4] of St. Justin, who reproaches the Jews with having denied that He was "God and the eternal Son of God;"[5] of St. Irenæus, who says explicitly that "the Holy Spirit proclaims Jesus Christ as *God* in the old and new Testament;"[6] of St. Clement of Alexandria, who enjoins us to believe "in the living God, who suffered and is adored;"[7] of Origen, who wrote in reply to Celsus that "the mark of a man of perverse mind is the not believing that Jesus is God;"[8] of Tertullian, who calls Him *de Deo Deus, ut lumen de lumine accensum;*"[9] of St. Hippolytus, who designates Him truly God;[10] of Eusebius, who proves that the divinity of Christ was acknowledged, as well as His humanity; not only by the first Fathers of the Church, but also in the hymns composed by the faithful from the earliest times. This Spirit proclaims Jesus Christ by the instrumentality of all the Councils, which have embraced, by confirming, the creed of Nice; by the agency of all the Fathers and Doctors,

[1] See the acts of their martyrdom.
[2] *Epist.* n. v and vii
[3] *Ad. Eph.* n. i and vii.
[4] *Epist. Smyrn. Eccles.* on his death, n. 14.
[5] *Triph.* n. 128, et passim.
[6] *Adv. Hæres*, lib. iii. c. 19. n. 2.
[7] *Cohort*, c. x.
[8] *Adv. Cels.* ii. 30, et passim.
[9] *Apol.* xxi.
[10] *Adv. Jud.* c. iv.

who concurred in defeating Arianism, and who have written since that great victory.

Therefore, according to the testimony of the Holy Spirit, unveiling the future by the lips of the prophets, then poured out in the Upper Chamber on the day of Pentecost, and since that time continuing to dwell in the bosom of the Catholic Church, . . . a testimony as ancient as the world, as wide spread and perpetual as the Church, as indisputable as that of the Father—according to that testimony, "Jesus Christ is God."

Thus does that snowy dove, the symbol of the Spirit of gentleness and love, which hovered over the head of the Saviour on the day of His baptism, while the words of the Father resounded in the heavens, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;"—reveal to us by its single appearance a permanent and universal fact: the testimony of the Holy Spirit to the God-Man.

To sum up the whole of this reasoning in the words of St. John which we have already cited: "There are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, And these three are one."[1]

The incarnate Word, Jesus Christ, says Himself that He is God; and His words, as we have already shown, are evidently disinterested, sincere, truthful, worthy of belief.

The Father confirms the truth of this declaration of His son, by miracles, that language of creative omnipotence, which is plain and universally understood. When non-existence obeys Him, shall man refuse Him obedience?

The Holy Spirit likewise testifies to Christ: we have heard His voice, that voice of which the Prophets and the Saints are so many echoes, and of which the Catholic Church is the infallible organ.

This threefold attestation of one and the same fact, emanating from the three divine Persons, ought to give

[1] 1 Joan. v. 7.

the greatest possible certainty to our faith. It confirms at one and the same time the dogmas of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Word, and of the divinity of Christ.

If we receive the testimony of men, says St. John, when they assert a fact which they have seen or heard, how can we refuse the testimony of God?[1]—a testimony of infinitely higher authority, since He is Truth itself, and the author of all truth. To reject it would be to suppose God a liar.[2]

No, No! Far from us be such audacity, such misery. We will accept it with docility and with joy. It shall be for us the *Gospel*, or *the glad tidings*. It tells us the truth, it gives us grace, it promises glory! We will believe; we will continue christians; we will attach ourselves to that Church which has never failed in her confession of the divinity of her Lord, repeating from age to age those words of her first pastor, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God! . . . "and by our faith made fruitful in good works we will merit that eternal life which was brought us by the Son of God!

V.

Variations of Protestants on the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the fundamental dogma of Christianity.

In order to attain this desired end by the profession of the true faith, it is urgently necessary that we lose no time in quitting the desolated fields of heresy.

It is true that at the beginning of the Reformation, the Protestant churches retained the fundamental dogma of the divinity of Christ. "We believe that Jesus Christ is God and man in one person . . . . and we abhor the diabolical inventions of Servetus, who attributes to Jesus Christ only an ideal Divinity," was the Confession of faith of the French Calvinist churches in 1605: and the

[1] 1 Joan. v. 9. [2] 1 Joan. v. 11.

Helvetic Confession, drawn up in 1562, says: We acknowledge that in Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, there are two distinct natures, the divine and the human, united in one person." The Synod of Dort in 1619 was not less explicit: "We believe that Jesus Christ, as regards His divine Nature, is the only Son of God." The Confession of Augsberg said: "We teach the doctrine of the council of Nice unanimously in our churches, and accordingly there is one only Christ, true God and true man." In the catechism of Heidelburg, which is followed by the reformed churches of Germany we read: Jesus Christ "is called the Son of God, because, from all eternity, He has been begotten of the essence of God, His Father, in an incomprehensible manner." And the Anglican Confession of faith declares that "Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, have been joined together in one person never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man."

But the abandoning of that Church through which we have the knowledge of Jesus Christ must soon lead to the denial of His divinity. Schism is a germ of death which is not slow to produce its fruits. The Reformers never ceased to reiterate that nothing was to be believed which was not expressly contained in Scripture; from this their disciples naturally inferred that they ought to reject the words *Trinity*, *consubstantial*, *essence*, *person*, *relation* and other terms which we should seek in vain in our sacred books. They affected to feel a supreme contempt for the teaching of the Fathers and Councils, and attributed a sort of infallibility to the individual mind; it was inevitable that this mind should seek to make discoveries. Besides, was not the pope Antichrist? Consequently must not the doctrine most opposed to that of the pope be the doctrine, the one doctrine worthy of Christ? Lastly, what were the examples given by the leaders of the party?

Luther had thrown himself into all the aberrations of Eutyches. He attributed to the human nature of Christ

ubiquity, or a presence in every place; he taught that *the Godhead had suffered*, and that we ought to say, "This flesh and this blood created heaven and earth." He confessed that he had the strongest dislike to the expression, "*consubstantial* with the Father."

Melancthon admitted in the Son of God *something of the divine nature, which had been obedient to the Father, and had been sacrificed for His glory.*

Calvin feared not to say that the Son of God was not essentially such; that, strictly speaking, the person of the Father alone was God in a preëminent sense; that Christ had come into the world like other men; that His reasonings were often unsound, and His refutations of the arguments of His opponents wanting in solidity; that He misapplied the words of the prophets; that He could only gain disciples from the dregs of the people; that He had been liable to ignorance, to imprudence, to want of reflection: that He had endured the death of the soul, and real despair. Jesus Christ—he taught—was really damned for a time, and what is everlasting for Judas was temporary for Him; He had no excellence capable of meriting, and of making God propitious to us: His miracles are not conclusive proofs of His divinity, &c., &c.[1]

This doctrine was too convenient not to spread with rapidity. The prince Radziwill, in the name of the Polish Reformed, asked Calvin and Bullinger whether it was not advisable to set aside the Trinity and the divinity of Christ openly and honestly, and to be content with regarding the Saviour as a divine man and a great prophet. According to the account given by Simler, the party who did not wish to see more in Jesus than a divine man gained ground after this movement, although Calvin's reply was marked by caution.[2]

The Polish ministers, in a public conference held at

[1] The text of all these statements of Calvin may be found exactly reproduced in the work entitled: "*L'ombre de Rousseau à Calvin.*"

[2] See the work just named.

Petricau, did not hesitate to reject the Council of Nice, to condemn Athanasius, to reëstablish the credit of Arius.[1] Francis David declared that he preferred Moses to Jesus.[2]

Faustus Socinus undertook to refute him. According to this reformer the quality of Son of God belongs to Jesus Christ, but only because as man He was begotten by the power of the Holy Ghost. Before entering upon His ministry, He went up to heaven to learn what He was to teach on earth. On His return from this journey He preached the Gospel to the world.[3]

Certain Mennonists maintain that Jesus Christ received not only His mission, but His Body in heaven. The Quakers also attribute to Him besides His external and earthly body, a spiritual or divine body, by which the second divine Person has at all times manifested Himself to mankind.[4]

As to the Anabaptists, they openly denied the divinity of the Saviour, and our modern Rationalists have followed in the same course. According to the Protestant historian of the Reformation, Socinianism invaded the German Lutheran churches, and Arianism the Reformed church. . . . In Germany, Jesus was first considered as a prophet, then as a sage, next as an enthusiast, and finally as an impostor."[5]

Geneva, the adopted country of Calvin, has distinguished itself among all the Protestant churches by its traditional Arianism. In the Encyclopedia, D'Alembert says of it: "Several of its ministers no longer believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ."[6] Rosseau has written: "If you ask the ministers of Geneva whether Jesus Christ is God, they dare not answer."[7] The catechism of the Na-

[1] Cited by Bellarmine, *Præf. de Christo.*

[2] See Bellarmine's *Præf. de Christo.*

[3] *Brevis institutio,* and *Catechismus Racoviensis.*

[4] See their Apology. Thes. xiii.

[5] Merle d'Aubigne, *Sommaire de l'histoire des dogmes,* 6me période. ch. v.

[6] On the word *Geneve.*

[7] Seconde lettre de la Montagne.

tional Church says, that Jesus Christ is called God because of the excellence of His nature; and among the duties we owe to Him it takes good care not to include adoration.

Nor does the Liturgy say more; while the preaching is so devoid of the Christian spirit, that in two hundred sermons printed in the course of half a century, we look in vain for a single declaration of faith in the Saviour's divinity. The theological theses are expressed vaguely or in a Socinian sense. On the 3d of May, 1817, it was agreed among the pastors that they should avoid maintaining their respective opinions on this article in order not to make their differences manifest.[1] At the present day the Dean of the national theology does not hesitate openly to say and to print that Jesus Christ is not God. He divides reasonable beings into four categories: God, Jesus Christ, angels and men. Here is his Voltairian profession of faith on the Christian doctrines:[2]

"It is a contradiction to say that the infinite Being is contained within the narrow limits of the human body.

"It is a contradiction to say that the unchangeable Being participates in all the variations attached to the condition of a human being, that He is a child, a boy, a young man, and at last comes to maturity.

"It is a contradiction to say that the supremely happy Being suffers from the weaknesses and miseries under which man is weighed down in a world of trial and a valley of tears.

"It is a contradiction to say that the Almighty was weak, was dispirited, and needed a created being to strengthen Him.

[1] All the pastors except three signed this compromise : " *We promise to abstain from establishing, either by an entire discourse or by part of discourse directed to this object, our opinion* (*sic*)—1. *on the mode in which the divine nature is united to Jesus Christ;* 2. on original sin ; 3. on the mode in which grace operates ; 4. on predestination. We also promise not to combat the *opinion* of any of the pastors on these subjects," etc. See Empeytar, *sur la Divinite de Jesus Christ.*

[2] *Essais,* voi. 1. p. 63.

"It is a contradiction to say that God, who is present everywhere, is in one single place, laid in a stable, sleeping in a boat, hidden in a tomb.

"It is a contradiction to say that the Eternal is wounded, pierced with nails, put to death, by men. Good sense alone is enough to convince us of this.

"It is a contradiction to say that three persons, having each severally their essence and their individuality, are one being."

The Protestant rationalists of Germany have arrived at the same end by other roads. In Kant's view, Christ is the ideal perfection of humanity. In Hegel's, the God-Man is the type of the union of the finite and infinite in man. According to Fichte, the word is made flesh, as in Jesus, in every man who understands His own oneness with God. Schelling maintains that the incarnation of God is from all eternity; the Man Christ is the culminating point of the human existence of the Deity, &c.

Dr. Strauss, professor of theology at Tubingen,—nominated to the pulpit of Zurich, but driven from that town by the people, who rose in revolt against the audacious absurdity of his docrines—applied himself to clear up and develop the cloudy Christology of Hegel. According to Strauss, Christ was a pious Jew, of a clear and honest understanding, but without any elevated ideas. Attracted by the reputation of John the Baptist, He asked for baptism at his hands and resolved on amendment. He afterwards devoted Himself to the preaching of repentance. The questions addressed to Him on the subject of His mission led him to think it very possible that He was the Messiah. He abandoned himself to this flattering idea, enthusiasm prevailed over modesty, and He ended by persuading Himself that He was the emissary of heaven.[1] His views and plans, however, were not extensive. He excluded the Gentiles from redemption, and figured to Himself the kingdom of the Messiah under

[1] De messiana sua dignitate sibi persuasit, *Wegscheider also says.*

the most material forms. His invectives against the Pharisees, and the contempt He affected for the Sabbath, drew on Him the fanatical hatred of the chiefs of His nation. This animosity was only embittered by His triumphal entry into Jerusalem; He was given up to His enemies by one of His disciples, and died upon the cross. Afterwards there grew up among His visionary disciples that multitude of legendary stories with which they embellished a life so prosaic, and which were brought together by unknown hands into the four gospels.[1]

Without any fear of contradicting himself, Strauss built up an entire system of dogma on this marvellous hallucination about Christ and His disciples,—a system which is only the more absurd in proportion as it pretends to be serious and logical. "The real subject of the attributes which the church assigns to Christ," he said, "is humanity. Humanity is the union of the two natures, it is God made man, the Infinite brought down to the finite condition, and the finite mind remembering its infinity. Humanity is the *child* of the visible mother (nature) and the invisible father (spirit). Humanity is the great *worker of miracles*, for, in the course of the human history, spirit is ever more and more gaining the mastery over nature, both within man and without; and before him nature sinks to the rank of inert matter, on which he exercises his active energy. Humanity is *impeccable*, because the progress of its development is irreproachable; blemishes only attach to the individual, they never affect the species and its history. It is humanity that *dies, rises again*, and *ascends to heaven;* because from the casting off of *what is merely natural* there arises a spiritual life which is ever more and more elevated," &c., &c.

Undoubtedly among the interpreters of dreams, the most distinguished rank must be assigned to Strauss. On

[1] Strauss has been learnedly refuted by Tholuck in a work "on the credibility of the Gospel history," translated by the Abbe Valroger.

the one hand never was there a dream more extravagant than the imaginings of this ambitious Christ and His credulous disciples; on the other, never was an explanation more luminous, more profound, and above all, more flattering to humanity. Humanity, at any rate, ought to be satisfied with Dr. Strauss, and might say to him, if Rousseau would not be offended, that *the inventor* of such an explanation of the gospel is *greater than its hero.*

His friends have justly remarked that his genius led him astray. "*Strauss is not consistent,*" said Krugg, the successor of Kant in the chair of philosophy at Kœnigsberg, "we must therefore look for a bolder mythicist, to appear some day, who will accuse his predecessor of timidity, and maintain that all which the documents of Christianity relate of its Founder, is mythical, without any exception."

This anticipation was soon realized. Bruno Bauer calls Strauss *a timorous orthodox, who seems to believe in the Holy Ghost!* Then comes Feuerbach, who acknowledges no Christ but humanity; who calls christianity an *innocent imbecility.* (Strauss made it a learned imbecility), "the incurable disease of bigots, a contagious cancer which eats out even the very talents of literary men and poets, an exhaustible mine of lies, impositions, delusions and madness; a filthy opinion, because it is polluted by selfishess, from which one turns away with disgust, as from a woman when she yields to the impure instincts of sensual pleasures." . . . . "That God became man," he exclaims in the style of Luther, "oh ye asses! do you think this a mystery? It would be much more wonderful if He had never existed, or if He had ceased to exist."

However, the Christ Humanity must needs disappear in its turn. "You are nothing but bigots," said Maximilian Stirner to those who had preceded him; "to put humanity in the place of God is to replace one superstition by another. There is nothing sacred but the indi-

vidual. The Christ-Humanity, like the historic Christ, is an invention of monks."

There is nothing sacred but the individual! It is the shout of barbarism setting up its tent on the ruins of christian civilization. It is the *consummatum est* of Christ dying under the deicidal blows of the pretended Reformation. It is the last word of heresy, which wishes to make God Himself the accomplice of its disorders, and the slave of its selfishness. *There is nothing sacred but the individual!* When the abomination of desolation is thus installed in the Holy of Holies, there is nothing to be done but to flee from this reprobate church, repeating with the angels of the ancient temple: *Let us depart hence! Let us depart hence!*

Here, says M. Chassay, Protestanism may contemplate itself at full length in its own work. "Up to this time the destructive work of the Protestant theologians appeared to have been carried on in the shade, as if they were ashamed of their treason: at the very time they were buffeting Christ they had said, 'I am a christian.' The book of Strauss (so soon completed by his followers) has been as a flash of lightning in the midst of that murky night. He has placed before some of his contemporaries a mirror in which their line of thought is faithfully reflected. He has written on the walls of a condemned Babylon the ill-omened presage of ruin and of death. The evil was done . . . . and as men speak low by the bedside of the dying, all kept hidden in their breasts the secret, which must bring despair to so many souls.

"It is true that as to sacrifice and self-devotion, the very life-throbs of the heart of Christian society, . . scepticism had destroyed them. It is true that there remained no more of the work of Luther than a shadow and a corpse. . . Protestanism, in breaking with Catholic tradition, had struck at the heart even of the history of Christianity; and a final blow of the axe had just laid low in an unbelieving church that great tree of faith which for

so long a time had covered with its kindly shade the generations of the past."

M. Littre translated Strauss into French, and prepared the way for M. Renan.

Successor to M. Quatremère in the chair of Hebrew at the college of France, M. Renan delivered only a single lecture, which called forth the suspension of his course, *for the sake of public order*, and led to the decree of June, 1864, by which his chair was declared vacant.

M. Renan is a writer who prefers obscurity to light and shade to color. His smooth and undecided language never brings out a clear idea. He is a Hebraist, who devotes himself to writing anti-christian theses in the style of pastoral addresses; an atheist piously employed in substituting for God—"*a good old-fashioned word a little heavy and material*"[1]—something of his own devising; a clerk in minor orders, who finds it easier to re-make Christ after his own likeness, than to reform himself after the image of Christ.

According to the latest writings of this professor, who has found sympathy among Jews and Protestants, "*God is not a determinate being external to us.* God is a *kind of impersonal consciousness, indeterminate, progressive, eternal, immaterial, not only in the universe considered as a whole, but in each of the beings that compose it; who is formed in proportion as man advances in the way of progress, but is not alone the whole of existence, which is still the absolute, the ideal, the order in which mathematics, metaphysics and logic are true, the living principle of the good, the beautiful and the true, the object of all love, the place of souls, &c., &c.*[2]

As to man, *there was a time when one species of animals gained a decisive superiority over the rest, and then man was distinguished from animals. . . . Beginning in this way humanity will come to an end. The distinction of persons has its principle in the distinctness of bodies. . . It is in God*

[1] *Liberte de penser*, Sept. 2, 1850.

[2] *Revue de deux mondes*, Oct. 15, 1863.

alone that God is immortal. We have yet to learn how souls can subsist eternally in God who does not subsist in Himself.

God and man being what we have stated, what shall Jesus Christ be? M. Renan recognizes the authenticity of the gospels, but if he admits the teaching of Jesus as having certainly emanated from Himself, he regards the miraculous facts of His life and death only as legendary tales.

Jesus, he says,[1] is *one of the manifestations of the God that is hidden in the depths of human consciousness;* Yes, if you will have it so, the highest consciousness of God that has existed in the breast of humanity is that of Jesus.[2] He was, however, an ignorant person who did not know Greek, in whom madness and inspiration were nearly allied; a revolutionary, the sworn enemy of wealth, of kings, and of priests, who did not shrink from imposture and blasphemy in order to free His country. His friends and disciples wished to see Him perform miracles. He lent Himself to their wish; nothwithstanding this, He was not deficent in sincerity, but there is nothing absolute in sincerity, the ancients judged of it very differently from ourselves, &c., &c. One of the causes of His distress in the garden of Olives was *the recollection of the young woman who perhaps might have consented to love Him.*[3] He Himself arranged with Martha and Mary to make people believe in the raising of Lazarus. Lazarus accordingly shut himself up in the tomb of his family, covered himself with grave clothes, pretended to be dead, and at the voice of Jesus, played the part of a man restored to life. Mary Magdalene, in her turn carried away by her love of Jesus, was able to persuade His apostles and disciples that the Crucified of Calvary was risen again, &c., &c.

Now observe this instance of the chastisement of pride. You deny creation, Monsieur Renan, because creation

[1] Vie de Jesus. *Introd.* [2] Vie de Jesus, p. 75.
[3] Vie de Jesus, p. 379.

obliges you to believe in a miracle, which above all things you wish to suppress, and you yourself admit that your mind is on the rack, *placed between the necessity of supposing a beginning of the universe, and the impossibility of admitting it.* You refuse to believe in the Incarnation of the Word in human nature, and you condemn yourself to believe in the incarnation of man in the nature of a brute! . . You deny the authentic geneaology of the Son of God become the Son of Mary; and you are reduced to the necessity of making your own in this way: Ernest Renan, who was the son of an animal, which was the son of a plant, which was the child of a mole, which was the child of an atom, which was the child of . . . of . . . of x. (an unknown quantity).

All the errors of heretics and infidels regarding the Holy Trinity, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the divine authority of the Church are condemned in the Decree of the Council of Trent on the symbol, which we have already given at page 101.

CHAPTER NINTH.

On Justification.

Sixth Session.

The workman is known by his work; and consequently, according to the manner in which they accomplish their most essential work, which is our deliverance from sin or our justification; shall we be able to judge of the respective merits of the Christ adored by Catholics, and the Protestant Christ.

I.

The Catholic doctrine on Justification.—Its nature, its causes, its developments, &c., &c.

The history of the cure of the paralytic will assist us in comprehending the Catholic doctrine of Justification. It is thus related by St. John.[1]

Under the porches of the pool, called in Hebrew Bethsaida, lay a great multitude of sick, of blind, of lame, of withered; waiting for the moving of the water. And an angel of the Lord descended at certain times into the pool, and the water was moved. And he, that went down first into the pool, after the motion of the water, was made whole of whatever infirmity he lay under. And there was a certain man there, that had been eight and thirty years under his infirmity. When Jesus saw him, and knew that he had been now a long time, He saith to him; Dost thou wish to be made whole? The infirm man answered him: Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool. For whilst I

[1] Joan. v.

am coming, another goeth down before me. Jesus saith to him; Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole: and he took up his bed, and walked. . . . Afterwards Jesus findeth him in the temple, and saith to him: Behold thou art made whole: sin no more, lest some worse thing happen to thee.

This is precisely the history of the justification of the sinner. Mankind, having lost by original sin their supernatural health and life, make this world, as it were, one great infirmary. All are suffering; some cannot see, others cannot hear the truth, others are unable to move towards good, some lose in their delirium the very sense of their misery: all have need of succor from on high. Into this vast hospital, the Angel of the Lord, the heavenly Physician of the human race, vouchsafes to descend at fixed times, and, by the virtue which He imparts to the baptismal water and to the words of pardon pronounced by the priest, that element and those words become remedies efficacious for the healing of our spiritual diseases. The cure, however, is granted only with the concurrence of an earnest and diligent will: *He who first went down into the pool:* and the first and indispensible condition of being healed is the wish to be so: *Wilt thou be healed?* For though man, however ardent his desire, cannot be restored without grace, yet on the other hand, grace however powerful, cannot save him unless he wills it. Jesus, therefore, says to the sinner, "Arise!" He helps him to raise himself up: "Take up thy bed and walk," and the sinner, joining his own efforts to those of his kind Physician, rises up and walks. Behold him cured, thoroughly cured: *sanus factus es.* He can and he should fall at the feet of the Lord to thank Him for his recovery; but observe what the Lord adds: Take care that thou sin not again, for a relapse is possible; and thereby thou wilt fall into a condition worse than the first.

Our justification then makes us really and inwardly

just, as the miracle wrought on the Paralytic really restored him to health: *sanus factus es.*

It comes to us from Jesus Christ, and can come to us only from Him, just as the healing virtue was given to the water only by the visit of the angel.

It is conferred on adults who concur, by their own free will, with the grace of the Saviour, poured forth through the sacraments of baptism and of penance. Thus the Lord asks the Paralytic if he wishes to be made whole. Infants are regenerated in baptism without this condition.

Lastly, it may be lost by sin, which would cause us to fall back into an abyss even deeper than that, from which we have been delivered: *Lest something worse befall thee.*

Let us return to these points, and say, as briefly as possible, what Justification is, whence it comes, what are its causes, and what are the laws, according to which it is granted, increased, lost, recovered, and made fruitful for heaven.

I. Justification, as indicated by its name, is a divine act making man just. By it, the recipient is translated from a state of sin, in which his birth according to the flesh had placed him, into a state of grace and adoption, in which he is established by his regeneration or new birth, through Christ. Not only are his sins forgiven and their stains effaced, but from being the enemy of God he becomes actually His friend. He loves God, if he is an adult; if he is an infant, he is disposed to love Him; and in both cases alike he is loved by God. This grace of charity, called also sanctifying grace, insinuates itself into the soul like a gentle unction, thoroughly pervades it, and makes it holy in proportion to the dispositions which the heart brings to co-operate with it. As this grace is not cognizable by sense, we can have only a moral or conjectural certainty of its presence in the soul.

Still concupiscence remains in the man, who is justified; he has thus the opportunity of contending and of obtaining merit, and so long as he refuses to consent to its sug-

gestions, it cannot deprive him of justice or sanctifying grace. The Apostle, therefore, said well in writing to the Corinthians; "Formerly you were sinners: but you have been cleansed, you have been sanctified, you have been justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the spirit of our God;"[1] and St. John when he called the Saviour "the Lamb of God, which effaces or takes away the sins of the world."[2]

Jesus Christ did not pray in vain to the Father that His disciples might be "sanctified in truth:" *Pater! sanctifica eos in veritate.* This end which He proposed to Himself in all His actions, in all His sufferings, He really attained: *that they be sanctified in truth.* According to our doctrine, the Redemption effected by His Blood has power and virtue sufficient to justify man, not in theory alone, not by falsely calling him that which in fact he is not, but by working a most complete and real change in his soul. We do not limit its office to pronouncing the acquittal of the offenders, while they still continue in reality offenders. What! had the old Adam power to make us inwardly sinners, and has not the new Adam power to make us inwardly just? Has the infernal serpent been able to wound us, and cannot the Lamb of God restore us to health? What the disobedience of one man has done for our loss, shall not the obedience of the Son of God, dying on the cross, do for our salvation? Did the Apostle exaggerate the virtue of Redemption, when he said that the grace of Jesus Christ has far surpassed in abundance and in efficacy the sin of the first man?[3]

From this doctrine it farther results, that when the work of our justification is accomplished, God sees us just, and as such He loves us. Now we cannot conceive that the God of truth and justice could ever, shutting His eyes to what He really sees, account and love as just,

[1] Hæc fuistis, sed abluti estis, sanctificati estis, justificati estis. 1 *Cor.* vi. 11.

[2] Joan. xvii. 19.

[3] Rom. v. 15, etc.

those who are still sinners, and, like the blind Isaac, bless Jacob in the stead of Esau.

Finally, we so far honor the Church, the chaste spouse of Jesus Christ, as to believe that she is the mother of many children, who are really worthy of her by their holiness, and we do not think so meanly of heaven as to open it to men, who are actually unjust and sinful. "The Church makes us sound," says St. John Chrysostom, "and is not content with giving us a certificate of soundness."[1] "She does not cut down our sins," says St. Augustine, "she roots them up."[2]

II. But whence is our justification derived? We believe that it is a grace or favor obtained by the merits of Jesus Christ, which the adult is called to prepare himself to receive and heartily to concur with.

We believe that it is a grace, an entirely free and gratuitous boon. This is what the Scriptures repeat in a thousand places. "You have been justified freely,"[3] says St. Paul to the Romans, and he devotes this Epistle to proving especially that Jews and Gentiles have all been called to the faith by a free grace, an unmerited vocation. "It is a grace," he concludes, "therefore it is not the fruit of their works."[4] This doctrine, defined in opposition to the Pelagians, who pretended that the sinner, by his own natural powers alone, could justify himself or at least begin to be just, is a necessary consequence of the principles, which we have laid down on the subject of the supernatural. The Creator evidently is not bound to bestow on His creatures more than the constitutive elements of their being. Still less when He has once been rejected by sin, is He under any obligation to draw the offended to Him, and if, notwithstanding, He does this, it is a double act of grace on His part, and the sinner, before attempting to justify himself by the strength of his fallen nature alone, is bound to offer to the divine

[1] *De Sacerd.* lib. iii. 6.
[2] Lib. 1. *ad Bonifac.*, c. xiii.
[3] Rom. iii. 24.
[4] Rom. xi. 6.

justice an adequate satisfaction for the sins he has already committed. But this he can never do: it is therefore absolutely necessary that the Angel of the Lord should come down to the poor Paralytic and assist him to recover his health. This grace is merited for us by Jesus Christ, and precisely because He is the meritorious and efficient cause of it, the Apostle calls Him "our justice, our sanctification, and our Redemption."[1]

While, however, it is thus necessary, that God should anticipate man by His grace, it is indispensable that the sinner (if an adult) should consent to and co-operate with this gift of heaven. "*Do you wish to be restored to health?*" is the enquiry of the heavenly Physician. Such is the respect with which He treats our liberty: "*Do you wish it?*" We may say, yes; or we may answer, no. "He who created thee independently of thyself," says St. Augustine, "does not justify thee independently of thyself." *Fecit nescientem, justificat volentem.*[2] There is no necessitating grace: and even under the impulse of its most powerful influences the will can still resist. Thus we are always in our own hands. God, in reforming His own work, does not destroy it: the Saviour comes to the help of man, without annihilating that original power, which was given him at his creation, and which constitutes him the arbiter of his own destiny. In this manner, by the right use of free will, prevented and assisted by grace, we are able to merit heaven as a *recompense.* Such is the kindness, such the wisdom with which the Redeemer has provided at the same time for our weakness and our dignity. Thus it is that He treats us with *as much respect* as love;[3] and knows how to unite the interests of our happiness and our glory. For if God saved us without our coöperation as He created us, how could heaven be the reward of our labors, the crown of merit, the triumph of the conqueror? And where is the

[1] 1 Cor. 1. 30. [2] Serm. clxix. (*de Verb. Apost.*) c. xi. n. 13.
[3] Cum magna reverentia disponit nos. *Sap.* xii. 18.

man who does not esteem it more happy and more honorable to receive a recompense won by laborious service, than to yield to an overpowering necessity? "A victory without danger is triumph without glory!"

The Apostle gave us the exact formula of the work of justification, viewed in its causes, and, in general, that of all our supernatural actions, when he said, "Not I, but the grace of God with me:" *Non ego, sed gratia Dei mecum.* He might have said to all those presumptuous men who rely on their own merits; "O man! what hast thou, that thou hast not received? and if thou hast received, why dost thou glory as if it were thy own?"[1] And yet he says with humility and with truth; "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. I expect therefore the crown of justice which the just Judge will award to me in that day, and not to me only but to them also that love Him."

III. Justification then is a grace merited by Jesus Christ, granted by the Lord with a view to His own glory and to our salvation, with which the adult is called on to concur, and which makes him really and inwardly just. Let us now consider the laws, according to which this grace is bestowed, increased, lost, recovered, made fruitful for heaven.

Justification was merited by Jesus Christ for all men without exception; for He died for all: but it is not actually bestowed on any, except those, to whom the merit of that death is communicated. "If we were not born of the blood of Adam," says the Council, "we should not be born sinners; so we cannot be born again to justice except by receiving a second birth from Jesus Christ." The best remedy is ineffectual, unless it be actually applied to the sick.

An infant does not receive this new life save in the Sacrament of Baptism, which on this account is called the sacrament of regeneration, and of which Jesus Christ

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 7.

has said; "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven[1] . . A martyr is considered as baptized in his blood.

The adult is called to justification by a preventing grace, which is for him, as it were, the principle of salvation. This grace, which may be resisted and absolutely rejected, draws the will on to prepare for reconciliation in a fitting manner, and always with freedom. The acts which predispose him for reconciliation, and which grace assists him to make, are, first, acts of faith: he hears the preaching of the Gospel, he believes the truth of the revelation, and God's faithfulness to His promises; he believes, especially, that God justifies the wicked by His grace, the fruit of Redemption. But in hearing the sacred law promulgated he perceives that he is a sinner; and therefore fears the justice of God provoked by his iniquities; after he has been cast down by this salutary shock, a feeling of confidence in the infinite mercy of his Creator presents itself and raises him up. He hopes that God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, will pardon him; and animated by such hope, he begins to love this God, the unfailing source of all justice; this love leads him to detest his sin, to repent of it, to repair it as far as may be, and makes him resolve to receive Baptism, and to observe the divine commandments. When the soul has these dispositions, it receives from the Holy Spirit in baptism, together with the remission of all its sins, the grace which makes it just; and at the same time it is incorporated into Jesus Christ, and united to that divine Head by the sacred ties of Faith, Hope and Charity.

In this work of preparation for receiving grace all is reasonable, well-ordered, necessary. Faith, called by the Council "the beginning of salvation," faith "without which it is impossible to please God,"[2] comes to man not from enthusiasm or individual inspiration, but from the word of God, received by hearing: *Fides ex auditu.*

[1] Joan. iii. 5. [2] Heb. xi. 6.

Accordingly the Church has been commanded "to preach the Gospel to every creature."[1] This faith is an act of adhesion on the part of man's understanding to the understanding of God, an indispensable preliminary to the submission of the human will to the divine.

As faith recalls to the sinner's mind the justice of God and his own unfaithfulness, it cannot but produce in him that "fear of the Lord," which the Scripture calls "the beginning of wisdom,"[2] "without which no one can be justified."[3] Undoubtedly nothing is more suitable than fear in the heart of a sinner who believes in the justice of his Judge; but then he believes also in His mercy, he believes in the infinite merits of the Redeemer's death; he is therefore raised up and cheered by hope, which he supports by the cross and fixes on God: by hope his heart is opened to the beginning of love, and he regrets and detests the sins he has committed, resolves to observe the divine commandments, seeks God earnestly, and appeals to Him as the Author of all justice and of every perfect gift. It is clear that God could not pardon the sin of one who still continued to love his sin, nor give His friendship to one, who was not resolved to obey His laws: and it is easy and pleasant to believe that, adding fresh strength to the incipient love, which He had Himself inspired, He at once responds to it by His own love, for it is written: "I love those who love me;" and again "our God is a consuming fire." What wonder if this fire by its radiating heat, lights up "the smoking flax" which is brought so near it! And thus that saying of St. Augustine is verified: "The house of God is founded by Faith, raised up by Hope, and crowned by Charity.[4]

The justice thus acquired admits of increase, and the just man may be justified more and more; he is compared by the Holy Ghost to the sunlight which goes on increasing from the dawn to the full mid-day.[5] It is by

[1] Marc. xvi. 15. [2] Prov. i. 5. [3] Eccli. i. 28.
[4] Serm. xxvii. c. 4. [5] Prov. iv. 18.

observing with ever increasing perfection the commandments of God and of His Church, that he rises from *virtues* to *virtues*, is united more and more intimately to God, and conforms to that precept of our Divine Master: "Be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." The most glorious career then is opened to fidelity and courage.

But never must we lay down our arms and look back; for if our justice may increase, it may also decay and be lost. Any grievous transgression of the precepts of God or of the Church would destroy, not faith,—faith is preserved even by the devils, of whom it is said that *they believe and tremble*,—but charity, which is always incompatible with disobedience. "He that keepeth my commandments," the Saviour has said, "he it is that loveth me."[1] And St. James says, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all."[2] Hence the just are warned to "work out their salvation with fear and trembling."[3] "He that thinketh he stands, let him take heed lest he fall."[4] "We ought all to watch and pray, that we may not be led into temptation." We are kept in distrust of ourselves and in humility, by the recollection of the angels, who were created in justice, and yet so soon proved unfaithful; of Saul, who was called by the Lord and afterwards rejected by Him; of David, upon whom so many graces had been bestowed, and who nevertheless fell so lamentably.

At the same time, he who, like David, has fallen, like him may rise again, only it will cost more efforts than were needed for obtaining the first justification. Instead of coming for Baptism, the sinner will be obliged to have recourse to the Sacrament of Penance, called by the Fathers a *toilsome baptism;* instead of merely detesting his sins he will be obliged to confess them, and to expiate them by a suitable satisfaction; instead of receiving the remission of all the punishment he had incurred, he will, most frequently, obtain only a temporary instead of an

[1] 1 Joan. xiv. 24. [2] Jacob ii. 10. [3] Philip. ii. 12. [4] 1 Cor. x. 12

eternal punishment. To him as to David the Lord will say,—provided he again brings all the conditions enumerated above, faith, hope, repentance, a firm resolution of amendment, and a beginning of love,—"Thy sins are forgiven thee: but the son of thy adultery shall die," or these riches, these pleasures, which thou hast loved too well, shall be taken from thee. By fasting, prayer and almsgiving, the sinner, now restored to a state of grace, inflicts on himself the punishment, which he has yet to undergo, and, by anticipating the divine justice disarms it.

Lastly, justification must produce its fruits. This supernatural life, grafted into Jesus Christ, cannot be inactive. Christ says, "He that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit."[1] These fruits, the product of our own soil, when watered by the blood of Christ, are called *good works*. As proceeding from our free will, these works are ours, and merit a reward; as proceeding from grace, animating our will, they are the gifts of God on which we must never pride ourselves, for without the help of God what would we have accomplished? Our divine Master has said, "Without me ye can do nothing;"[2] and His Apostle, "No man can say the Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost."[3] Thus when God crowns the deserts of His servants, He is crowning His own gifts, as the Church, consecrating the words of the great Augustine, has expressed it.

Multiply then your good works, ye just souls, for "every good tree bringeth forth good fruit,"[4] and "the tree that does not yield good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire."[5] Multiply your good works, to increase your merits and to embellish your crown. Multiply your good works, for they glorify God and edify your neighbor.[6] Perform the works of obligation; add to them the works of counsel, for if, in order to enter on the way of life we must keep the commandments,[7] so

[1] Joan. xv. 5. [2] Joan. xv. 5. [3] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [4] Matth. vii. 17.
[5] Matth. iii. 10. [6] Matth. v. 16. [7] Matth. xix. 17.

when we leave al. to follow Jesus Christ, we merit a treasure in heaven.[1] But, while bringing forth these good works, redouble your efforts to be humble, lest pride should poison your virtue and precipitate your fall. "Watch and pray;" warned as you have been that "the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak,"[2] full of gratitude towards your God, it is but justice: severe towards yourself, it is justice also; not judging your brother, for whether he stand or fall concerns his own master;"[3] and "when you have done all that is commanded you," humble and faithful Christians, say again with the utmost sincerity, "we are unprofitable servants."[4]

Such is the Catholic doctrine of justification. It must appear, without doubt, to all unprejudiced minds, worthy of God, beautiful, holy, eminently suited to encourage all virtue, and to be subservient to the glory of our Creator and our Saviour. We conceive that it is superfluous to support it by the authority of the Fathers. Our adversaries give them up to us. Chemnitz admits that they speak of justification as we do; and after explaining his own system he quietly adds, "I am well aware that the Fathers teach otherwise, but the point is to ascertain, whether they are right or not."[5] We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to placing before you here the exposition of this doctrine,—so luminous and so pure, so precise and so complete,—which was drawn up by the Fathers of Trent, and read in their sixth session, after it had received all their suffrages.

[1] Matth. xix. 21. [2] Matth. xxvi. 41. [3] Rom. xiv. 4.
[4] Luc. xvii. 10. [5] Exam. conc. Trid.

II.

SIXTH SESSION.

HELD JANUARY 13, 1547.

Decree on Justification.

PROEM.

Whereas there is, at this time, not without the shipwreck of many souls, and grievous detriment to the unity of the Church, a certain erroneous doctrine disseminated touching Justification; the sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost,—the most reverend lords Giammaria del Monte, bishop of Palæstrina, and Marcellus of the title of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, priest, cardinals of the holy Roman Church, and legates apostolic *a latere*, presiding therein, in the name of our most holy father and lord in Christ, Paul III., by the providence of God, Pope,—purposes, unto the praise and glory of Almighty God, the tranquillizing of the Church, and the salvation of souls, to expound to all the faithful of Christ the true and sound doctrine touching the said Justification; which (doctrine) the sun of justice, Christ Jesus, *the author and finisher of our faith*,[1] taught, which the Apostles transmitted, and which the Catholic Church, the Holy Ghost reminding her thereof,[2] has always retained; most strictly forbidding that any henceforth presume to believe, preach, or teach, otherwise than as by this present decree is defined and declared.

CHAPTER I.

On the Inability of Nature and of the Law to justify man.

The holy Synod declares first, that, for the correct and sound understanding of the doctrine of Justification, it is necessary that each one recognize and confess, that, whereas all men had lost their innocence in the prevarication of Adam—having become unclean,[3] and, as the Apostle says, *by nature children of wrath*,[4] as (this Synod) has set forth in the decree on original sin,—they were so far *the servants of sin*,[5] and under the power of the devil and of death, that not the Gentiles only by the force of nature, but not even the Jews by the very letter of the law of Moses, were able to be liberated, or to arise, therefrom; although free will, attenuated as it was in its powers, and bent down, was by no means extinguished in them.

[1] Hebr. xii. 2. [2] Joan. xiv. 26. [3] Isai. lxiv. 6.
[4] Ephes. ii. 3. [5] Rom. vi. 17.

CHAPTER II.

On the dispensation and mystery of Christ's advent.

Whence it came to pass that the heavenly Father, *the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort,*[1] when that blessed *fullness of the time was come,*[2] *sent* unto men, Jesus Christ, *His own Son*—who had been, both before the Law, and during the time of the Law, to many of the holy fathers announced and promised—*that He might both redeem the Jews who were under the Law,*[3] and that *the Gentiles, who followed not after justice,* might attain to justice,[4] and that all men might receive the adoption of sons. Him God hath *proposed* as a victim of propitiation *through faith in His blood,*[5] *for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for those of the whole world.*[6]

CHAPTER III.

Who are justified through Christ.

But, though *He died for all,*[7] yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated. For as in truth men, if they were not born propagated of the seed of Adam, would not be born unjust, —seeing that, by that propagation, they contract through him, when they are conceived, injustice as their own,—so, if they were not born again in Christ, they never would be justified; seeing that, in that new birth, there is bestowed upon them, through the merit of His passion, the grace whereby they are made just. For this benefit the Apostle exhorts us, evermore *to give thanks to the Father, who hath made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the saints in light, and hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we have redemption, and remission of sins.*[8]

CHAPTER IV.

A description is introduced of the Justification of the impious, and of the manner thereof under the law of grace.

By which words, a description of the Justification of the impious is indicated,—as being a translation, from that state, wherein man is born a child of the first Adam, to the state of

[1] 2 Cor. i. 3. [2] Gal. iv. 4. [3] Gal iv. 4.
[4] Rom. ix. 30. [5] Rom. iii. 25. [6] 1 Joan. ii. 2.
[7] 2 Cor. v. 15. [8] Coloss. i. 12, 14.

grace, and of *the adoption of the sons of God*,[1] through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Saviour. And this translation, since the promulgation of the Gospel, cannot be effected, without the laver of regeneration, or the desire thereof, as it is written; *unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*[2]

CHAPTER V.

On the necessity, in adults, of preparation for Justification, and whence it proceeds.

The Synod furthermore declares, that, in adults, the beginning of the said Justification is to be derived from the preventing grace of God, through Jesus Christ, that is to say, from His vocation, whereby, without any merits existing on their parts, they are called; that so they, who by sins were alienated from God, may be disposed through His quickening and assisting grace, to *convert* themselves to their own justification, by freely assenting to and co-operating with that said grace: in such sort that, while God touches the heart of man by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, man is not himself utterly without doing anything, while he receives that inspiration, forasmuch as he is also able to reject it; yet is he not able, by his own free will, without the grace of God, to move himself unto justice in His sight. Whence, when it is said in the sacred writings: *Turn ye to me, and I will turn to you*,[3] we are admonished of our liberty; and when we answer: *Convert us, O Lord, to thee, and we shall be converted*,[4] we confess that we are prevented[5] by the grace of God.

CHAPTER VI.

The manner of Preparation.

Now they (adults) are disposed unto the said justice, when, excited and assisted by divine grace, conceiving *faith by hearing*,[6] they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which God has revealed and promised,—and this especially, that God justifies the impious *by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*;[7] and when, understanding themselves to be sinners, they, by turning themselves, from the fear of divine justice, whereby they are profitably agitated, to consider the mercy of God, are raised unto hope, confiding that God will be propitious to them for Christ's sake; and they begin to love Him as the fountain of all justice; and are therefore

[1] Rom. v. 23. [2] Joan. iii. 5. [3] Zach. i. 3. [4] Sam. v. 21.
[5] Præveniri. [6] Rom. x. 17. [7] Rom. iii. 24.

moved against sins by a certain hatred and detestation, to wit, by that penitence, which must be performed before baptism: lastly, when they purpose to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to *keep the commandments* of God. Concerning this disposition it is written: *He that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him;*[1] and, *Be of good faith, son, thy sins are forgiven thee;*[2] and, *The fear of the Lord driveth out sin;*[3] and, *Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;*[4] and, *Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;*[5] finally, *Prepare your hearts unto the Lord.*[6]

CHAPTER VII.

What the Justification of the impious is, and what are the causes thereof.

This disposition, or preparation, is followed by Justification itself, which is not remission of sins merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man, through the voluntary reception of the grace, and of the gifts, whereby man from unjust becomes just, and of an enemy a friend, that so he may be an heir according to hope of life everlasting.[7]

Of this Justification the causes are these; the final cause indeed is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, and life everlasting; while the efficient cause is a merciful God who *washes and sanctifies*[8] gratuitously, *signing*, and anointing with the Holy *Spirit of promise, who is the pledge of our inheritance;*[9] but the meritorious cause is His most beloved only begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, *for the exceeding charity wherewith he loved us*,[10] merited Justification for us by His most holy passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction for us unto God the Father; the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which (faith) no man was ever justified;[11] lastly, the formal cause is the justice of God, not that whereby He Himself is just, but that whereby He maketh us just, that is to say; with which *we* being endowed by Him, *are renewed in the spirit of our mind*,[12] and we are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are, just, receiving justice within us, each one according to his own measure, *which the Holy Ghost distributes to every one*

[1] Hebr. xi. 6.
[2] Matth. ii. 5.
[3] Eccli. i. 27.
[4] Act. ii. 38.
[5] Matth. xxviii. 19.
[6] 1 Kings, vii. 3.
[7] Titus, iii. 7.
[8] 1 Cor. vi. 11.
[9] Ephes. i. 13, 14.
[10] Ephes. ii. 4.
[11] Hebr. xi.
[12] Ephes. iv. 23.

as He wills,[1] and according to each one's proper[2] disposition and co-operation. For, although no one can be just, but he to whom the merits of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are communicated, yet is this done in the said justification of the impious, when by the merit of that same most holy Passion, *the charity of God is poured forth*, by the Holy Spirit, *in the hearts*[3] of those that are justified, and is inherent therein: whence, man, through Jesus Christ, in whom he is ingrafted, receives, in the said justification, together with the remission of sins, all these (gifts) infused at once, faith, hope, and charity. For faith, unless hope and charity be added thereto, neither unites man perfectly with Christ, nor makes him a living member of His body. For which reason it is most truly said, that *Faith without works is dead* and profitless;[4] and, *In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision, availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by charity*.[5] This faith, Catechumens beg of the Church —agreeably to a tradition of the apostles:—previously to the sacrament of Baptism; when they beg for the faith which bestows life everlasting, which, without hope and charity, faith cannot bestow; whence also, do they immediately hear that word of Christ; *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments*.[6] Wherefore, when receiving true and Christian justice, they are bidden, immediately on being born again, to preserve it pure and spotless, as *the first robe*[7] given them through Jesus Christ in lieu of that, which Adam lost for himself and for us, that so they may bear it before the judgment-seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may have life everlasting.

CHAPTER VIII.

In what manner it is to be understood, that the impious is justified by faith, and gratuitously.

And whereas the Apostle saith, that man is *justified by faith* and *freely*[8] these words are to be understood in that sense, which the perpetual consent of the Catholic Church hath held and expressed; to wit, that we are therefore said to be *justified by faith*, because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation, and the root of all Justification; *without which it is impossible to please God*,[9] and to come unto the fellowship of His sons; but we are therefore said to be justified *freely* because that none of those things, which precede justification—whether faith or works —merit the grace itself of justification. For, *if it be a grace, it*

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 2. [2] Propriam, own, peculiar. [3] Rom. v. 5.
[4] Otiosa, idle. Jacob. ii. 20. [5] Ephes. v. 6.
[6] Matth. xix. 17. [7] Luc. xv. 22.
[8] Rom. iii. 4. [9] Hebr. xi. 6.

is not now by works, otherwise, as the same Apostle says *grace is no more grace.*[1]

CHAPTER IX.

Against the vain confidence of Heretics.

But, although it is necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted, nor ever were remitted save gratuitously by the mercy of God, for Christ's sake; yet is it not to be said that sins are forgiven, or have been forgiven, to any one who boasts of his confidence and certainty of the remission of his sins, and rests on that alone; seeing that it may exist, yea does in our day exist, amongst heretics and schismatics; and with great vehemence is this vain confidence, alien from all godliness, preached up in opposition to the Catholic Church. But neither is this to be asserted,—that they who are truly justified must needs, without any doubting whatever, settle within themselves that they are justified, and that no one is absolved from sins and justified; but he that believes for certain that he is absolved and justified; and that absolution and justification are effected by this faith alone: as though whoso has not this belief, doubts of the promises of God, and of the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ. For even as no pious person ought to doubt of the mercy of God, of the merit of Christ, and of the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, even so each one, when he regards himself, and his own weakness and indisposition, may have fear and apprehension touching his own grace; seeing that no one can know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error,[2] that he has obtained the grace of God.

CHAPTER X.

On the increase of Justification received.

Having, therefore, been thus justified and made the friends and *domestics of God*,[3] advancing *from virtue to virtue*,[4] they are *renewed*, as the Apostles says, *day by day*;[5] that is, *by mortifying the members of their own flesh*,[6] and *by presenting them as instruments of justice unto sanctification*,[7] they, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church, faith co-operating with good works, increase in that justice which they have received through the grace of Christ, and are still further justified, as it is written: *He that is just, let him be jus-*

[1] Rom. xi. 6.
[2] Cui non potest subesse falsum.
[3] Ephes. ii. 19.
[4] Ps. lxxxiii. 8.
[5] 2 Cor. iv. 16.
[6] Coloss. iii. 5.
[7] Rom. vi. 13. 19.

tified still;[1] and again, *Be not afraid to be justified even to death;*[2] and also, *Do you see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.*[3] And this increase of justification holy Church begs, when she prays, "Give unto us, O Lord. increase of faith, hope and charity."[4]

CHAPTER XI.

On keeping the Commandments, and on the necessity and possibility thereof.

But no one, how much soever justified, ought to think himself exempt from the observance of the commandments; no one ought to make use of that rash saying, prohibited by the Fathers, under an anathema,—that the observance of the commandments of God is impossible for one that is justified. For God commands not impossibilities, but, by commanding, both admonishes thee to do what thou art able, and to pray for what thou art not able (to do),[5] and aids thee that thou mayst be able; *whose commandments are not heavy;*[6] *whose yoke is sweet and whose burthen light.*[7] For, whoso are the sons of God, love Christ; but *they who love him, keep his commandments,*[8] as *Himself* testifies; which, assuredly, with the divine help, they can do. For, although, during this mortal life, men, how holy and just soever, at times fall into at least light and daily sins, which are also called venial, not therefore do they cease to be just. For that cry of the just, *Forgive us our trespasses*, is both humble and true. And for this cause, the just themselves ought to feel themselves the more obliged to walk in the way of justice, in that, *being* already *freed from sins, but made servants of God,*[9] they are able, living soberly, justly, and godly,[10] to proceed onwards *through Jesus Christ, by whom they have had access unto this grace.*[11] For God forsakes not those who have been once justified by His grace, unless He be first forsaken by them. Wherefore, no one ought to flatter himself up with faith alone,[12] fancying that by faith alone he is made an heir, and will obtain the inheritance, even though *he suffer not with Christ, that so he may be also glorified with Him.*[13] For even Christ Himself, as the Apostle saith, *Whereas He was the Son of God, learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and being consummated,*

[1] Apoc. xxii. 11.
[2] Eccli. xviii. 22.
[3] Jacob. ii. 24.
[4] Dom. 13, post Pentecost.
[5] St. Aug. De Nat. et gr. c. 43.
[6] 1 Joan. v. 3.
[7] Matth. xi. 30.
[8] Sermones, words, Joan. xiv. 15.
[9] Rom. vi. 18.
[10] Titus. ii. 12.
[11] Rom. v. 2.
[12] Nemo sibi in sola fide blandiri debet, no one ought to rely on faith alone.
[13] Rom. viii. 17.

He became, to all who obey Him, the cause of eternal salvation.[1] For which cause the same Apostle admonishes the justified, saying; *Know you not that they that run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain. I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty: I so fight, not as one beating the air, but I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection; lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away.*[2] So also the prince of the Apostles, Peter; *Labor the more that by good works you may make sure your calling and election. For doing those things, you shall not sin at any time.*[3] From which it is plain, that those are opposed to the orthodox doctrine of religion, who assert that the just man sins, venially at least, in every good work; or, which is yet more insupportable, that he merits eternal punishments; as also those who state, that the just sin in all their works, if, in those works, they, together with this aim principally that God may be glorified, have in view also the eternal reward, in order to excite their sloth, and to encourage themselves *to run in the course:* whereas it is written, *I have inclined my heart to do all Thy justifications for a reward:*[4] and, concerning Moses, the Apostle saith, that *he looked unto the reward.*[5]

CHAPTER XII.

That a rash presumption in the matter of Predestination is to be avoided.

No one, moreover, so long as he is in this mortal life, ought so far to presume as regards the secret mystery of divine predestination, as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate; as if it were true, that he that is justified, either cannot sin any more, or if he do sin, that he ought to promise himself an assured repentance; for except by special revelation, it cannot be known, whom God has chosen unto Himself.

CHAPTER XIII.

On the gift of Perseverance.

So also as regards the gift of perseverance, of which it is written, *He that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved:*[6] —which gift cannot be derived from any other but Him, who is able to establish him who standeth[7] that he stand perseveringly,

[1] Hebr. v. 8, 9. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 24, 26, 27. [3] 2 Pet. i. 10.
[4] Ps. cxviii. 112. [5] Hebr. xi. 26. [6] Matth. xxiv. 13.
[7] Rom. xiv. 4.

and to raise up him who falleth:—let no one herein promise himself any thing as certain with an absolute certainty; though all ought to place and repose a most firm hope in God's help. For God, unless men be themselves wanting to His grace, *as He has begun the good work, so will he perfect it, working* (in them) *to will and to accomplish.*[1] Nevertheless, *let those who think themselves to stand, take heed lest they fall,*[2] and, *with fear and trembling work out their salvation,*[3] in labors, in watchings, in alms-deeds, in prayers and oblations, in fastings and chastity: for knowing that *they are born again unto a hope of glory,*[4] but not as yet unto glory, they ought to fear for the combat, which yet remains with the flesh, with the world, with the devil, wherein they cannot be victorious, unless they be with God's grace, obedient to the Apostle, who says; *We are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh: for if you live according to the flesh, you shall die; but if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live.*[5]

CHAPTER XIV.

On the fallen, and their restoration.

As regards those who, by sin, have fallen from the received grace of Justification, they may be again justified, when, God exciting them, through the Sacrament of Penance, they shall have attained to the recovery, by the merit of Christ, of the grace lost. For this manner of Justification is the reparation of the fallen: which the holy Fathers have aptly called a second plank after the shipwreck of grace lost.[6] For, on behalf of those, who fall into sins after baptism, Christ Jesus instituted the sacrament of Penance, when He said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.*[7] Whence it is to be taught, that the penitence of a Christian, after his fall, is very different from that at (his) baptism; and that therein are included not only a cessation from sins, and a detestation thereof, or, *a contrite and humble heart,*[8] but also the sacramental confession of the said sins,—at least in desire, and to be made in its season,—and sacerdotal absolution; and likewise satisfaction by fasts, alms, prayers, and the other pious exercises of a spiritual life; not indeed for the eternal punishment,—which is, together with the guilt, remitted either by the sacrament, or by the desire of the sacrament,—but for the temporal punishment, which, as the sacred writings teach, is not always wholly remit-

[1] Philipp. i. 6; ii. 13. [2] 1 Cor. x. 12. [3] Philipp. ii. 12.
[4] 1 Petr. i. 3. [5] Rom. viii. 12, 13.
[6] Hieron. Ep. ad Demetr. [7] Joan. xx. 22, 23. [8] Ps. l. 19.

ted, as is done in baptism, to those who, ungrateful to the grace of God which they have received, have *grieved the Holy Spirit*,[1] and have not feared *to violate the temple of God*.[2] Concerning which penitence it is written; *Be mindful whence thou art fallen; do penance, and do the first works*.[3] And again; *The sorrow that is according to God worketh penance steadfast unto salvation*.[4] And again; *Do penance*, and *bring forth fruits worthy of penance*.[5]

CHAPTER XV.

That, by every mortal sin, grace is lost, but not faith.

In opposition also to the subtle wits of certain men, who, *by pleasing speeches and good words, seduce the hearts of the innocent*,[6] it is to be maintained, that the received grace of Justification is lost, not only by infidelity, whereby even faith itself is lost, but also by any other mortal sin whatever, though faith be not lost; thus defending the doctrine of the divine law, which excludes from the kingdom of God not only the unbelieving, but the faithful also (who are) *fornicators, adulterers, effeminate, liers with mankind, thieves, covetous, drunkards, railers, extortioners*,[7] and all others who commit deadly sins; from which, with the help of divine grace, they can refrain, and on account of which they are separated from the grace of Christ.

CHAPTER XVI.

On the fruit of Justification, that is, on the merit of good works, and on the nature of that merit.

Before men, therefore, who have been justified in this manner,—whether they have preserved uninterruptedly the grace received, or have recovered it when lost,—are to be set the words of the Apostle: *Abound in every good work, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord*;[8] *for God is not unjust, that he should forget your work, and the love which you have shown in his name*;[9] *and, do not lose your confidence, which hath a great reward*.[10] And, for this cause, life eternal is to be proposed to those working well *unto the end*,[11] and hoping in God, both as a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God through Jesus Christ, and as a reward which is according to the promise of God Himself, to be faithfully rendered to their good works and

[1] Ephes. iv. 30.
[2] 1 Cor. iii. 17.
[3] Apoc. ii. 5.
[4] 2 Cor. vii. 10.
[5] Matth. iii. 2.
[6] Rom. xvi. 18.
[7] 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.
[8] 1 Cor. xv. 58.
[9] 1 Cor. x. 35.
[10] Matth. x. 22.
[11] 2 Tim. iv. 8.

merits. For this is that *crown of justice* which the Apostle declared was, after his *fight* and *course, laid up for him, to be rendered to him by the just judge, and not only to him, but also to all that love his coming.*[1] For, whereas Jesus Christ Himself continually infuses his virtue[2] into the said justified,—as the head into the members, and the vine into the branches,—and this virtue always precedes and accompanies and follows their good works, which without it could not in any wise be pleasing and meritorious before God,—we must believe that nothing further is wanting to the justified, to prevent their being accounted to have, by those very works which have been done in God, fully satisfied the divine law, according to the state of this life, and to have truly merited eternal life, to be obtained also in its (due) time, if so be, however, that they depart in grace; seeing that Christ, our Saviour, saith: *If any one shall drink of the water that I will give him, he shall not thirst for ever; but it shall become in him a fountain of water springing up unto life everlasting.*[3] Thus, neither is our own justice *established as our own* as from ourselves;[4] nor is the justice of God ignored or repudiated; for that justice which is called ours, because that we are justified from its being inherent in us, that same is (the justice) of God, because that it is infused into us of God, through the merit of Christ. Neither is this to be omitted,—that although, in the sacred writings, so much is attributed to good works, that Christ promises, that even *he that shall give a drink of cold water to one of his least ones, shall not lose his reward;* and the Apostle testifies that, *That which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory;*[5] nevertheless God forbid that a Christian should either trust or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose bounty towards all men is so great, that He will have the things, which are His own gifts, be their merits.[6] And forasmuch, as *in many things we all offend,*[7] each one ought to have before his eyes, as well the severity and judgment, as the mercy and goodness (of God); neither ought any one *to justify himself, even though he be not conscious to himself of anything;*[8] because the whole life of man is to be examined and judged, not by the judgment of man, but of God, *who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise*

[1] Jugiter virtutem influat.
[2] Joan. iv. 13, 14.
[3] Rom. x. 3.
[4] Matth. x. 42.
[5] 2 Cor. iv. 17.
[6] Epist. Cælest. i. c. 12. Labb. T. ii. p. 1617. De qua vid Constant in Ep. 21. Cælest.
[7] Jacob. iii. 2.
[8] 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

from God,[1] who, as it is written, *will render to every man according to his works*.[2]

After this Catholic doctrine on Justification, which whoso receiveth not faithfully and firmly cannot be justified, it hath seemed good to the holy Synod to subjoin these canons, that all may know not only what they ought to hold and follow, but also what to avoid and shun.

III.

Errors and Variations of Protestants on Justification.

Before we bring forward these canons let us briefly remind you of those Utopias which the so-called Reformers opposed to the Catholic doctrine of justification; a doctrine so pure and holy, so worthy of Jesus Christ and of the Church, so entirely in harmony with Holy Scripture and with all tradition.

When men wish to emancipate themselves upon a system from all laws human and divine, they may imagine many such systems. They may oppose to the law, which presses heavily upon them, the accommodating doctrines of Pantheism, which protects them, as it were, by a divine shield. They may with our *Fourierists* and *Phalanterians*, deny the existence of moral evil, declare all our passions innocent, and condemn nothing but the law, which thwarts these holy impulses of our nature. Finally, they may acknowledge sin, recognize it in themselves, but proclaim that it is necessary, unavoidable, . . . and at the same time perfectly compatible with the friendship of God, with predestination to life, and with salvation.

Of these three systems the last seems to me to be the worst. It is degrading, devoid of consolation, inconsistent and immoral; nevertheless it is that, which was eagerly adopted by the leading doctors of the reformation, by the Lutherans and still more by the Calvinists.

They started from the principle, that the freedom of man was destroyed by original sin; that thenceforward, according to Luther's comparison, he was nothing more

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 5. [2] Matth. xvi. 27.

than a statue, a stock, a stone, a saw in the hands of the workman, a beast of burden led by the bridle; that free will meant only enslaved will; that God was the author of the treason of Judas, as well as of the calling of St. Paul; that "He moved our will, not by leaving it the power of obeying or resisting, as all ages up to that time had believed, but by Himself effectively producing its acts." These are the words of Calvin.[1]

To be consistent, they ought to have said nothing more of justification, or of sin, or of the duty of believing; of any law whatsoever, or of predestination, or of salvation. They had merely to follow a miserable fatality. To say to christians, "you are sinning even in obeying the infernal necessity which drags you on," was to require them to believe an absurdity, which could only lead them to despair. By the loss of free will sin became incurable and salvation impossible. This earth, even after the coming of Jesus Christ, was only an anticipation of hell.

However, it was necessary for them to explain their doctrine and to reply to Catholics; they attempted therefore to introduce some order into all this chaos. Together with the doctrine of an enslaved will and necessary evil, they preserved a sort of justification, a process for obtaining it, and a means of losing it, with a distinction between the reprobate and the elect!—

1. Justification was no longer to be anything more than acquittal accorded to a guilty person, while he still continued in his guilty state. "To be justified," according to the Apology,[2] "is not to be changed from being wicked to being just, but to be declared just in a legal (or forensic) sense. *To justify*, means to acquit an accused person and to declare him innocent, for the sake of a justice which does not belong to him."—"Justification," says the Formula of Concord,[3] "does not suppose sanctifica-

[1] *Instit.* l. ii. c. 3; Dollinger, *The Reformation*, l. iii.
[2] *De dilect. et implet. legis.* art. iii.
[3] *Solid. declar.*

tion."—"Man is declared to be virtuous and just and held to be such, because of the obedience of Jesus Christ, although, in consequence of his corrupt nature, he is still a sinner, and continues such to his grave."

The Calvinists are of the same opinion. "Man appropriates to himself the merits of Jesus Christ, and he is declared just," are the words of the Helvetic confession.—In the Heidelberg Catechism, the question is asked: "How are you just before God?" and the answer is: "Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ, so that even though my conscience reproach me with having sinned grievously against all the commandments of God, and not having kept any of them, and with being still inclined to evil, God nevertheless accords to me the perfect satisfaction, the justice and holiness of Christ, and imputes them to me, as if I was without sin, as if I had myself discharged the debt of obedience which Christ has paid for me."

Osiander took a different view of justification. According to him the essential justice of God is shed forth in us, precisely as the rays of the sun, when it appears above the horizon, diffuse themselves throughout nature; so that we become just by the very justice of God.

However, the system of imputation prevailed. In justification obtained by this means there were no degrees; it must be equal in all those, who received it. Accordingly, Luther, in all humility, equalled himself to the Apostles Peter and Paul, and even to the Mother of God.[1] Again, it could not increase, since it is in nowise an interior or real thing. All these consequences were admitted.

2. But how is this mask of justice, which seems to deceive God Himself, to be procured?

The Lutherans and the Reformed answer: "By faith alone." The Apology says:[2] "We obtain the remission of sins by faith alone in Jesus Christ, and not by charity, nor because of charity or good works." And the Formula

[1] Sermon for the Nativity.

[2] Art. ii.

of Concord:[1] "Neither charity, nor repentence, nor any other virtue, but faith alone, which is the sole means and the sole instrument with which and by which we are able to receive the grace of God, the merits of Jesus Christ and the remission of our sins." Hence Luther concludes;[2] "The christian, even though he wished it, cannot lose his salvation, however great his sins may be, provided he does not cease to believe; no sin can damn him except want of faith." And Melancthon; "Even though you sin, and that openly, do not regard your actions; think of the promise of God, and in confidence in that promise believe, that you have no longer a Judge in heaven, but a Father who bears you in His Heart."[3]

Luther wrote to him in 1521: "If you preach grace, preach the reality and not the appearance of it: if grace is a reality, bring it a true and substantial sin (to cure) and not a mere semblance of sin. God does not save those who have only a semblance of sin. Sin then and sin stoutly; but still more stoutly trust and rejoice in Jesus Christ, who is the conqueror of sin, of death and of the world. We must sin as long as we are here below. This life is not the habitation of justice, 'but we look for new heavens and a new earth,' says Peter, 'in which justice dwelleth.' It is sufficient that, by the abundant liberality of the glory of God, we have known the Lamb who taketh away the sin of the world; sin will not separate us from Him, though we committed a thousand murders and a thousand fornications, nay, a thousand murders and a thousand fornications in a single day. Can you believe that a Lamb so precious has not superabundantly paid the ransom of all our crimes?"

This faith which is thus required for obtaining acquittal is not the assent of the understanding to divine revelation, as faith is understood by the Catholic Church; it is simply an act of confidence in redemption by Jesus

[1] Solid. declar. art. iii.

[2] De Captiv. Babyl., t. ii. fol. 284.

[3] *Inst.*, c. ii. 1, 3

Christ. "Believe that Christ died for thee and that thy sins are forgiven," says the Apology, "and thou art justified."

Besides, this faith ought to be absolutely certain, excluding all doubt, as Calvin says, and bravely insulting over the devil and over death.

But, is it necessary for us to co-operate with the grace of God in order to have this faith? Not at all. God gives it us without our concurrence. The contrary opinion was called *synergism*, and was repudiated as an apostacy by the Lutheran doctors.[1]

They went still further: they taught that even this easy act of faith was not necessary. "That it was sinners who received grace by the death of God; not those sinners who believe, but sinners simply: that the greater their unworthiness the more perfectly was their condition such, as grace required; and that no one could attain to happiness unless he had first been a sinner and under the curse." This manner of explaining the gospel accorded the highest prize of justification to the greatest villains, and made the path of wickedness the very way to heaven. Krummacher did not shrink from maintaining this doctrine in a work entitled, "*A glance into the kingdom of grace.*" Without doubt he had caught a sight of the penitent thief on his way to heaven, and had been turned out, before he had been able to see any others.

"My sins may be displeasing to God," says the Methodist Fletcher, (vol. iv. p. 97.) "my person is always pleasing to Him. Though I sinned more than Manasses, I should not the less be a beloved child of God, because He always sees me in Christ. Hence it follows that in the midst of adulteries, of murders and incests, He may address to me the words, "Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is not a spot in thee." And in another place: "Though I blame those who say, 'Let us sin that grace may abound,' still, after all, adultery, incest and murder

[1] See Dollinger, *Synergism* and *Majorism*. t. iii.

will make me more holy on earth and more joyful in heaven."

3. A justification so freely and abundantly bestowed, ought to be difficult to lose. The Lutherans maintained that no one could be deprived of it except by losing faith. But how are we to lose faith, when God gives it to us without co-operation on our part? This contradiction they did not explain. Beza, and the Reformed after him, were more consistent. According to them faith and consequently justice cannot be lost.

It is sufficient then, it seems, that you have once in your life believed in Jesus Christ, and you are sure of salvation? Precisely so, as much as Peter and Paul. But is nothing else necessary? No, said the Lord by the mouth of Luther:[1] None shall escape my judgment except he who confines himself to faith alone; if you add anything to it, you are undone. I am the only door that leads to heaven. . . . they who present themselves, all covered with works, as a pilgrim of St. James with his shells, will not be admitted. If you come with great sacks full of works, you must begin by throwing them down, otherwise you will not be able to make your way in." And in reply to Erasmus he wrote thus: "If pious people do good in order to attain to heaven, they will never attain to it, and will rather be counted among the wicked." The Formula of Concord adopted this doctrine: "The propositions, which affirm the necessity of good works for salvation, are with good reason rejected. They deprive the afflicted conscience of the consolations of the Gospel, give rise to doubts, and are dangerous in several respects."

Luther went even further than this; he maintained, in opposition to the censure of the Pope, the *impossibility* of good works, seeing that a bad tree, such as the heart of man always is, could not produce good fruits. "In the judgment of God," wrote Melancthon, "every work even

[1] Sermon for Whitmonday.

of a just man is damnable and is a mortal sin." Amsdorf attempted to prove that the proposition, "Works are prejudicial to salvation," was true and just and preached by St. Paul and Luther; George Major was censured by the oracles of Lutheranism for having maintained the necessity of works, and afterwards arrested and sentenced to banishment.

But is it not at least requisite to observe the law? "No, for he who believes in Christ is dead to the law," said Luther, "as he is dead to sin, to hell and to the devil." Agricola even declared himself opposed to the law, forbade it to be used, and originated *Antinomianism* a system of which the principle is, war against the law.

"Christ is a Saviour, but not a legislator," says Luther again, "and no one, were he an Angel, could have the right of imposing on christians laws to which they had not consented."

But if this be the case whence comes it that there are any reprobates? Calvin explains it thus: "According to an unalterable decision, God has predestined certain men to show forth His mercy and to reign in heaven, others to serve as subjects for His justice and to suffer everlasting torments: it is absolutely necessary that both should arrive at the end, which their Creator has appointed for them; and for those who are predestined to heaven, it is useless to will it, since they could not be rejected, as those that are chosen for hell could not be saved, whatever exertions they might make." And, as if the reprobate were not sufficiently wretched under the weight of this inexorable fatality, Calvin, to put the finishing stroke to their misery, teaches, that at no period of their lives could they have become just,[1] which is a consequence of the indefectibility of justice.

The whole doctrine of Calvin on predestination was thus faithfully summed up by the Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Geneva, in 1831;[2]

[1] *Institut.* l. iii. c. 24.

[2] *Essais*, t. ii. p. 499.

"Man is born corrupt and condemned; all his actions are hateful to the Supreme Being. The faith and conversion of man are independent of himself and of his own exertions. His conversion is as much a miracle as the resurrection of a dead man. The Redemption of Jesus Christ is not applicable to all men, its efficacy is restricted to the predestined and elect; for there is a predestination to life and to death, to salvation and to damnation; the lot of every man is unalterably fixed, before he is born; some are destined to happiness without works, and in spite of their works are justified by faith only: the rest are condemned, whatever be their conduct, and the punishments they will have to undergo are eternal. All is done for the glory of God, and that glory does not shine forth more in the hymns of the saints than in the despairing cries of the reprobate."

But these doctrines are execrable! It is true; and Gomar was right in saying that they exhibited God such as we had been accustomed to regard Satan. The effects which they produced showed that the tree could be judged by its fruits. Luther himself wrote thus: "In our own days we see many who, after hearing the Gospel, become worse than they were before. Men who formerly had only one devil, are now possessed by seven, so that under the holy light of the Gospel they are more avaricious, more tricky, more selfish, more dissolute, more unholy than they were formerly under popery."[1] "I have seen the gospellers come out from their preachings," says Erasmus, "with their features all disordered, and their looks full of menace, like men who have just been hearing discourses of sedition and bloodshed."

And yet these hideous theories are not entirely abandoned. They still find favor with some. Doctor Ryle, in the question which he has recently addressed to the christian world, "*Are you pardoned?*" *Question for* 1850, reproduces all these enormities under the slight disguise

[1] Dollinger, art. *Luther*, t. i. p. 276.

of a pharisaical mysticism. In his view the best action done by the best of men is nothing more than a splendid sin, and the pardon of God only an acquittal accorded prior to any sanctification. Accordingly, the Apostles, the Martyrs, the Saints, who are reigning in heaven, are only pardoned sinners. As the waters of the deluge, he says, covered and hid the tops of the highest mountains, so can the blood of Jesus Christ hide and cover your greatest sins. Pardon is accorded to faith alone, and this saving faith in Christ is compatible *with many imfirmities.* This pardon is eternal in this sense, that the man once pardoned can never more be condemned, or again become the slave of Satan, etc., etc.

The Anabaptists, the Quakers, the Arminians, the Swedenborgians, and other sects, have repudiated these impure doctrines; Luther himself often combatted them, and it will be remembered that the original pretext for his war against the Church, was, that indulgences derogated from the merit of good works. The Calvinists, without regarding works as necessary, condemned those who despised them; Swedenborg declared that Luther and Melancthon were damned for having taught a soul-destroying doctrine on this subject, and bringing Luther on the stage in the middle of hell fire, he makes him say: "It is no wonder that I was deceived myself: but that a single fool should have made so many others go mad, does astonish me."[1]

To stay this plague the Council pronounced the following anathemas:

IV.

On Justification.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that man may be justified before God, by his own works, whether done through the teaching of human nature, or that of the law, without the grace of God through Jesus Christ; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that the grace of God, through

[1] Wonders of heaven and hell.

Jesus Christ, is given only for this, that man may be able more easily to live justly, and to merit eternal life, as if, by free will without grace, he were able to do both, though hardly indeed and with difficulty; let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one saith, that without the preventive inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and without his help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent as he ought, so as that the grace of Justification may be bestowed upon him; let him be anathema.

CANON IV.—If any one saith, that man's free will moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates towards disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification; that it cannot refuse its consent, if it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever, and is merely passive; let him be anathema.

CANON V.—If any one saith, that, since Adam's sin, the free will of man is lost and extinguished; or, that it is a thing with only a name,[1] yea a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan; let him be anathema.

CANON VI.—If any one saith, that it is not in man's power to make his ways evil, but that the works that are evil God worketh as well as those that are good, nor permissively only, but properly, and of Himself, in such wise that the treason of Judas is no less his own proper work than the vocation of Paul; let him be anathema.

CANON VII.—If any one saith, that all works done before Justification, in whatsoever way they be done, are truly sins, or merit the hatred of God; or that the more earnestly one strives to dispose himself for grace, the more grievously he sins; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII.—If any one saith, that the fear of hell,—whereby, by grieving for our sins, we flee unto the mercy of God, or refrain from sinning,—is a sin, or makes sinners worse; let him be anathema.

CANON IX.—If any one saith, that by faith alone the impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of Justification, and that it is not in any way necessary, that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema.

CANON X.—If any one saith, that men are just without the justice of Christ, whereby He merited for us to be justified; or that it is by that justice itself that they are formally just; let him be anathema.

CANON XI.—If any one saith that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and *the charity which*

[1] Rem esse de solo titulo, a thing in name only, un etre de raison.

is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost,[1] and is inherent in them; or even that the grace, whereby we are justified, is only the favor of God; let him be anathema.

CANON XII.—If any one saith, that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake; or that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified; let him be anathema.

CANON XIII.—If any one saith, that it is necessary for every one, for the obtaining the remission of sins, that he believe for certain, and without any wavering arising from his own infirmity and indisposition, that his sins are forgiven him; let him be anathema.

CANON XIV.—If any one saith, that man is truly absolved from his sins and justified, because that he assuredly believed himself absolved and justified; or, that no one is truly justified but he who believes himself justified; and that, by this faith alone, absolution and justification are effected; let him be anathema.

CANON XV.—If any one saith, that a man, who is born again and justified, is bound of faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate; let him be anathema.

CANON XVI.—If any one saith, that he will for certain, of an absolute and infallible certainty, have that great gift of perseverance unto the end,—unless he have learned this by special revelation; let him be anathema.

CANON XVII.—If any one saith, that the grace of Justification is only attained by those who are predestined unto life; but that all others who are called, are called indeed, but receive not grace, as being, by the divine power, predestined unto evil; let him be anathema.

CANON XVIII.—If any one saith, that the commandments of God are, even for one that is justified and constituted in grace, impossible to keep; let him be anathema.

CANON XIX.—If any one saith, that nothing besides faith is commanded in the Gospel; that other things are indifferent, neither commanded nor prohibited, but free; or, that the ten commandments nowise appertain to Christians; let him be anathema.

CANON XX.—If any one saith, that the man who is justified and how perfect soever, is not bound to observe the commandments of God and of the Church, but only to believe; as if indeed the Gospel were a bare and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments; let him be anathema.

CANON XXI.—If any one saith, that Christ Jesus was given

[1] Rom. v. 5.

of God to men, as a Redeemer in whom to trust, and not also as a legislator whom to obey; let him be anathema.

CANON XXII.—If any one saith, that the justified, either is able to persevere, without the special help of God, in the justice received; or that, with that help, he is not able; let him be anathema.

CANON XXIII.—If any one saith, that a man once justified can sin no more, nor lose grace, and that therefore he that falls and sins was never truly justified; or, on the other hand, that he is able, during his whole life, to avoid all sins, even those that are venial,—except by a special privilege from God, as the Church holds in regard of the Blessed Virgin; let him be anathema.

CANON XXIV.—If any one saith, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of Justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof; let him be anathema.

CANON XXV.—If any one saith, that, in every good work, the just sins venially at least, or—which is more intolerable still—mortally, and consequently deserves eternal punishments; and that for this cause only he is not damned, that God does not impute those works unto damnation; let him be anathema.

CANON XXVI.—If any one saith, that the just ought not, for their good works done in God, to expect and hope for an eternal recompense from God, through His mercy and the merit of Jesus Christ, if so be that they persevere to the end in well doing and in keeping the divine commandments; let him be anathema.

CANON XXVII.—If any one saith, that there is no mortal sin but that of infidelity;[1] or, that grace once received is not lost by any other sin; however grievous or enormous, save by that of infidelity; let him be anathema.

CANON XXVIII.—If any one saith, that, grace being lost through sin, faith also is always lost with it; or, that the faith which remains, though it be not a lively faith, is not a true faith; or, that he who has faith without charity is not a Christian; let him be anathema.

CANON XXIX.—If any one saith, that he, who has fallen after baptism, is not able by the grace of God to rise again; or, that he is able indeed to recover the justice which he has lost, but by faith alone without the sacrament of Penance, contrary to what the holy Roman and universal Church—instructed by Christ and his Apostles—has hitherto professed, observed and taught; let him be anathema.

CANON XXX.—If any one saith, that, after the grace of Justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt[2] is

[1] Infidelitatis. unbelief. [2] Culpa.

remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment[2] is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment[3] to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him); let him be anathema.

Canon xxxi.—If any one saith, that the justified sins when he performs good works with a view to an eternal recompense; let him be anathema.

Canon xxxii.—If any one saith, that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified; or, that the said justified, by the good works, which he performs through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life,—if so be, however, that he depart in grace,—and also an increase of glory; let him be anathema.

Canon xxxiii.—If any one saith, that, by the Catholic doctrine touching Justification, by this holy Synod set forth in this present decree, the glory of God, or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ are in way derogated therefrom, and not rather that the truth of our faith, and the glory in fine of God and of Jesus Christ are rendered (more) illustrious; let him be anathema.

[1] Reatus æternæ pœnæ, condemnation to eternal punishment.
[2] Reatus pœnæ temporalis, condemnation to a temporal punishment.

CHAPTER TENTH.

On the Sacraments.

Seventh Session, Held March 3, 1547.

Preamble of the Decree on the Sacraments.

"For the completion of the salutary doctrine of justification, which was promulgated with the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the last preceding Session, it hath seemed suitable to treat of the most holy Sacraments of the Church, through which all true justice either begins, or being begun is increased, or being lost is repaired. With this view, in order to destroy the errors and to extirpate the heresies, which have appeared in these our days on the subject of the said most holy sacraments,—as well those which have been revived from the heresies condemned of old by our Fathers, as also those newly invented, and which are exceedingly prejudicial to the purity of the Catholic Church, and to the salvation of souls,—the sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein, adhering to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, to the apostolic traditions, and to the consent of other councils and of the Fathers, has thought fit that these present canons be established and decreed; intending, the divine Spirit aiding, to publish later the remaining canons, which are wanting for the completion of the work which It has begun."

I.

What the Sacraments become from the point of view of Justification by Faith only.

We have laid before you the theory of the Reformers (as they call themselves) on justification. Their doctrine on the sacraments is the necessary consequence of that theory.

If faith alone justifies, man needs only means that are capable of exciting that sentiment in his heart: sacraments can have no other effect than this. They will serve therefore to awaken faith in the soul; that is, confidence in the Saviour; and that will be all.

It follows as a necessary consequence, from this, that sacraments need not have been instituted by Jesus Christ; that their number is undetermined; that *the* sacrament *par excellence* is preaching; that every body can administer sacraments, seeing that any being whatever, man, angel or devil, male or female, Christian or unbeliever, is able, at least by chance and without intending it, to excite faith for the moment. The real Calvinists, if any such there be, who regard justice and faith as indefectible, ought to go further and admit that the sacraments are not necessary.

Luther places the whole efficacy of the sacraments in the faith which they excite.[1] According to him, they are outward signs, promising divine grace to believers. The sacraments of the New Law, therefore, have no more efficacy than those of the Old Law, since they do not excite faith more powerfully. However, the faith of the church can supply the want of personal faith in the recipient of the sacrament. Thus owing to the faith of his parents, the new-born child is *changed*, *purified*, *renewed*

[1] Omnia sacramenta ad fidem alendam sunt instituta. . . Tota eorum efficacia est ipsa fides et operatio, per orationem Ecclesiæ credentis. . . Parvulus fide infusa mutatur, mundatur et renovatur. Non dubitarem etiam adultum impium, eadem Ecclesia orante, posse in quovis sacramento mutari, etc. *De Captiv. Babyl. De Baptismo.*

by baptism, an ungodly adult may obtain the same grace from the faith of the church, etc.

In the view of Zuinglius, the sacraments are signs or ceremonies by which the person gives an evidence that he is a candidate or a soldier of Christ, and an assurance of his faith, not so much to himself as to the church.[1]

Calvin follows an intermediate line. The sacraments, he says against Zuinglius, are added to the promise, to give us a stronger assurance of it. They even rank higher than the word of God, inasmuch as they represent the promise of salvation with more vividness, and, as it were, in a picture.

Carlstadt and Swenkfeld formally denied the sacraments. The Socinians made them ceremonies which were only useful for uniting the faithful externally, and distinguishing them from Jews and Pagans.[2]

The Quakers considered Baptism and the Lord's Supper as simply symbolical acts, the one representing the inward purification of the christian, the other his communion with Christ; figures instituted by our Lord through consideration for the weakness of His contemporaries, but which are no longer necessary for our age which has become spiritual, since the Holy Spirit was poured out on Fox and Penn.

As to the rationalists, they have carried their contempt of the sacraments so far, as to propose the following words as a formula for the distribution of the Supper: "Drink a little wine. The virtue is not in the wine, it is in yourselves, in the doctrines of God, and in God."[3]

It is high time then to turn back to the truth from which they have strayed. Let us state to those who are disposed to listen to us, the nature, the number, the effi-

[1] Sunt ergo sacramenta signa vel cæremoniæ, quibus se homo Ecclesiæ probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque Ecclesiam totam potius certiorem de tua fide quam te. See *Comment de vera religione.*

[2] In *Epist. ad Rom.* iv. ii.

[3] This proposal was made by Dr. Lange, *Hist. som des dogmes*, p. 254.

cacy, the administration and the ceremonies of the sacraments.

II.

Nature of a Sacrament and its analogies with the Incarnation.

Jesus Christ is God-man. In consequence His actions are *theandric*, i. e., at the same time divine and human. As divine, they confer grace, they work miracles, they give an infinite value to the desires, the prayers, the sufferings of the Saviour; as human, they not only serve as examples to us, but exhibit to our eyes by means of words, gestures or other signs the miracle wrought or the grace operated.

Thus suppose that Jesus would cure a man born blind: the sign which He employs to make the performance of this miracle sensible is remarkable. He makes clay by mixing His spittle with the dust of the earth, anoints the blind man's eyes with this new kind of salve, and bids him go and wash in Siloe; he does so and obtains his sight.

Does He wish to give speech and hearing to one deaf and dumb? He puts his finger into the ears and touches the tongue with spittle, saying *Ephpheta*, "Be opened;" and the ears of the deaf are opened and the tongue of the dumb unloosed.

The sick are brought to Him that He may cure them *by His touch;* Jesus touches them and they are restored to health.

The woman who has an issue of blood says to herself: "If I shall but touch the hem of His garment, I shall be whole;" and she makes her way through the crowd, and touches the fringe of the Saviour's robe, and immediately the issue of blood ceases.

To give wine for the guests at Cana, Jesus commands the servants to fill six great vases, but with water, and then orders them to draw from these and take to the

chief steward of the feast. To raise up to life the daughter of Jairus, He takes her by the hand: at the divine touch she rises. Lazarus does not return to life, except at the accents of that almighty call: *Lazare, veni foras!* "Lazarus, come forth!" The five loaves in the wilderness are multiplied in passing through His hands.

When He wills to bestow purely spiritual favors, the Saviour makes use of similar means, which serve as signs and instruments of His divine operations. He grants to Magdalen the remission of her sins by saying: "Thy sins are forgiven thee." He gives the Holy Spirit to His apostles—that Spirit which proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, and is as it were their breath—by breathing upon them.

But these theandric operations, which conveyed grace at the same time that they made it sensible by means of visible signs, demanded of the Saviour of mankind a character of perpetuity and universality which He could not refuse, for He wills the salvation of all men: He cannot consent to the loss of any one whatsoever, and He has promised to be with His apostles, that is, to act and work with them, all days, even to the consummation of the ages.

In consequence, Jesus Christ, still and always, as God the only worker of grace, as Head of the Church, will cause the human sign of the grace wrought to be produced by other men, on whom in a special manner He will bestow this power; and this is what the Gospel, as explained by the Acts of the Apostles, by their Epistles and by all tradition, tells us took place in the institution of the *sacraments*.

To destroy sin in the children of Adam, and cause them to be born again to the life of God's true children, the Saviour calls for *water*, as though He would submerge the sinner in a new deluge: but while the old man, the man of sin, alone remains buried under the wave, the new man, the christian, the fruit of the sufferings of Calvary, born

through the death of Christ to eternal life, comes forth from this liquid tomb, a striking image of that "sepulchre" which alone is "glorious." Such is the effect, such the significance of *Baptism*, which Jesus Christ commands His apostles to administer to all the nations of the world, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Little children are brought to Jesus, "that He may lay His hands on them and pray."[1] Such is the sign which by His command the apostles are to employ in order to impart to new christians that Divine Spirit which He promised to send His Church, to console it in His absence; and such, in fact, is the symbolical act which they make use of; "They imposed their hands," St. Luke tells us,[2] "and they" (the converted Samaritans) "received the Holy Ghost."

But Jesus wishes to give Himself wholly to us, He wishes to make that humanity which He took for our salvation, the food of our new life. "His flesh," He tells us, "is food indeed, and His blood drink indeed." He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day;" and, "Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood you shall not have life in you."[3] In order to accomplish this mystery of love, after offering the sacrifice of the paschal lamb on the eve of His death, He takes bread and blesses it, saying; "This is my body which is sacrificed for you: eat ye of it." Then blessing the cup into which He had poured wine, He said: "In this cup is my blood, my blood shed for the remission of sins and to cement the new and everlasting covenant; "drink ye all of it;" and He adds: "Do this which I have done for a commemoration of me;" a formal precept which the apostles were careful to obey, as St. Luke[4] and St. Paul[5] inform us, realizing the same wonders in the same manner and by the same words.

[1] Matth. xix. 13. [2] Act. viii. 14. [3] Joan. vi.
[4] Act. ii. 42; xiii. 2. [5] 1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 23; Heb. xiii. 10.

The Saviour remitted by a word the sins of the paralytic, of Zaccheus, of Magdalen: He gives His apostles power to do the same in regard to christians who have fallen back into sin, saying to them: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

In order to afford the sick the special help which they need, He sent His apostles to anoint them with oil;[1] a practice which, after the ascension of the Son of God, St. James recommended in these words: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."[2]

Lastly, when in the supper-room the High-Priest of the new law pronounced those words; "Do this which I have done for a commemoration of me;" and afterwards those others; "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven," He imparted to His disciples His priesthood "after the order of Melchisedech, which is to endure for ever;" a priesthood which, according to the testimony of St. Paul,[3] is accompanied by a special grace, conferred by the imposition of hands.

And when the divine Bridegroom of the Church recalled marriage to its primitive laws, rendered it holy, pure, indissoluble, made it the sacred sign of His union with our humanity, He assuredly did not refuse to the yoke now made so heavy the grace which alone can render it supportable.

Now it is these theandric actions of the God-man, producing grace in that they are divine, and making that production sensible in that they are human—whether wrought directly by Jesus Christ himself, or mediately by means of others who are made His instruments—that are called *sacraments*.

[1] *Marc.* vi. 13. [2] *Jacob.* v. 14. [3] 2 *Tim.* i. 6.

The Greeks call them *mysteries;* St. Augustine calls them "visible forms of invisible grace." A sacrament, says Hugo de St. Victor, is a material element which in virtue of some resemblance represents, in virtue of its institution by Jesus Christ signifies, and in virtue of its consecration contains, some invisible and spiritual grace. The views which Scripture and the Fathers give us of sacraments, may be summed up in the following definition: A sacrament is a sensible sign, instituted by Jesus Christ, to be permanently used by Him as an instrument in the production of grace.

The true Church, then, the Church in which are found the remission of sins and everlasting life, the Church with which the God-man resides, that is, in the bosom of which He daily operates according to His promise, even to the end of the world, must have sacraments, and all the sacraments which Jesus Christ has instituted; otherwise the action of the Saviour for its good would be, in part, paralyzed, the powers of hell would have prevailed against it.

But, further, a sect in which the sacraments of the Incarnate Word had been abandoned, would evidently be placed beyond the limits of His operations and be deprived of His presence. By this simple fact alone, nay, by being deprived of any one of the sacraments of Christ, it would be convicted of not being His Church.

Such is the misfortune of the Protestant sects. Without regard to the explicit testimonies of scripture and of tradition, Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin, opposed their veto to the saving operations of the God-man: and since that time, among the multitudes led astray by these blind guides, God the Saviour has ceased to work the remission of sins in the sacrament of Penance and to bestow everlasting life in the Eucharistic sacrifice and communion at the altar and holy table; He has no longer given the Holy Spirit to the young, when growing up, or afforded the purification of the soul and the solacing of

the body to the dying: He has no longer added His grace to marriage, and divorce has become necessary; He has no longer consecrated priests for Christians who are without divine worship and without sacrifice; He has even, alas! too often abstained from regenerating in His blood and exalting to the dignity of Christians, children sprung from families that had been Christian for ten or fifteen hundred years!

By the institution of Sacraments, Jesus Christ teaches us the indispensable necessity of grace for salvation. "Without me," He said, "you can do nothing." Without me you are like the poor traveller lying on the road to Jericho, covered with wounds, not able to rise, or move, or even call for help. It is necessary that the Good Samaritan should pass that way; that He should stop; that He should come to him and bind up his wounds; that He should put him on the way, and supply him with means for going on to his journey's end. Without Me, you are like the poor paralytic, waiting in vain for the helping hand which was to put him into the pool. Thus, haughty Sicambrian, you see these drops of water taken from the brook; the grace of your regeneration is attached to them, and if you do not go to them to seek a spiritual new birth, which they impart through the operation of the Holy Ghost, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . Nor is this all. You see that bread, reduced to proportions so small, which the priest at the altar will change into my sacred body: verily, verily, I say unto you, if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. . . You are a sinner, but a repenting sinner. Well, come, come like the ten lepers, show your souls with all their sins to my priests: *Ite, ostendite vos sacerdotibus!* If they retain your sins, I retain them; if they remit them, I remit them. . . How greatly does all this humble our pride, testify to our own insufficiency in all that relates to our salvation, and loudly proclaim the absolute sovereignty

and indispensable necessity of grace! In what close dependence on the ministers of the Church is the Christian placed! How ought this ministry of the Church show itself the faithful guardian, the zealous dispenser of these means of salvation! How greatly indebted is, not the man merely, but the Christian, the priest himself, to these created things, so weak and contemptible in themselves, which nevertheless God employs to work so many miracles! For if the Lord could show His power by changing stones into children of Abraham,[1] how much more does His omnipotence beam forth, when He makes the bread of the altar the very body of His dear Son!

Do not say then, I entreat you, my dear reader, "It is all very well; still I am reflecting . . . I hope . . . I am studying the question . . . I am waiting, . . . I shall see about it by and bye, . . . I love what is good, . . . I seek the truth. . . All this, is yourself. And you and I, and all men, all things here, without grace, are but nothingness and sin. Take a better course, detach yourself from yourself, humble yourself, repent, pray fervently, and as soon as possible bow your head beneath the waters of Baptism. Confess your sins, obtain the forgiveness of them, communicate, and then, only then, when the grace of God has been poured into your heart, by the channels which He has chosen, then we shall hope something . . . not from you . . . never from you, but from the grace of God working in you.

Sin had penetrated through our senses in order to infect our soul; grace follows the same road in order to purify us. But sin came to us from Adam and drags us down to hell; grace comes to us from Jesus Christ and leads us up to heaven.

The sacramental sign fixes the attention of the understanding, elevates the thoughts, speaks to the imagination, moves the heart, produces a deep impression on the memory. The arrangements of the tribunal of penance,

[1] Luc. iii. 8.

in themselves so simple, often affect, even to tears, the prodigal child who is returning from a far country to the arms of his father. At the moment when General Radet went to intimate to Pius VII. that he must follow him as a prisoner, he was struck with stupor at the sight of the vicar of Jesus Christ; and we know from his own testimony, he saw his first communion appear before him.

The sacraments produce another excellent effect, that of placing the faithful in the most complete, the most continual, the most indispensable, the most salutary dependence on the Church. Thus the new-born babe must receive Baptism from her, under pain of being excluded from the kingdom of heaven in case of its death. Scarcely does the child begin to live the life of the understanding and the heart, when, in order to prepare for his first communion, he receives from the Church a catechist and confessor. The catechist will conduct his religious education for several years; it will be the duty of the confessor frequently to see his penitent, to raise him after his falls, to bind up his wounds, to direct him in all his ways. Every Sunday the believer is called to assist at the sacrifice of our altars and to receive the instructions of his pastors. But the catechist, the parish priest, the confessor are not enough. When just growing up, the young Christian ought to give an account of his faith and receive the Holy Ghost, under the imposition of the bishop's hands. If he is called at a later period to become the head of a family, he will receive the nuptial benediction from the chaste bride of Jesus Christ; from her, he will seek Holy Orders, if he is called to the sublime functions of the priesthood; finally, at the last moment, when the Christian has to leave this land of exile to go to his true country, to pass from time to eternity, the good shepherd comes to give him the viaticum, the provision necessary for this great journey; and Extreme Unction effaces from his heart the last stains of sin, and assists him in attaining to the abode of glory. Thus has

the babe of a day old been carried in the arms of the Church; thus does she receive the old man's last sigh, she presides at his burial, she continues to pray over his tomb. Nothing then produces a greater and more beneficial concentration in Christendom, nothing does more to unite the faithful to each other and with their pastors, these again with their heads, the bishops, and these again with their supreme head, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, than the necessity of receiving the sacraments, confided by Jesus Christ to the dispensation of His ministers.

III.

Of the institution and number of the Sacraments.

When we treat of each of the sacraments in particular, we shall prove—it will be easy to do—that each of them was instituted *immediately* by our Saviour. Such is the sentiment of almost all Catholic Theologians. The Council of Trent was satisfied with defining that they were all instituted by Jesus Christ. Those who maintain that the institution was *mediate*, hold that Jesus Christ had said to His Apostles, for instance: "I will that there be in my Church a sacrament for the spiritual and bodily relief of the sick; you will yourselves have to determine the matter, the forms, the minister of that Sacrament. This view, though it has not been condemned, is not approved.

The number of the Sacraments, says St. Thomas, has been determined by our Saviour, with a provident attention to our wants: "Look at a well constituted commonwealth," says this holy Doctor; "you become a member of it by birth or naturalization; you receive education in it; there you ought to find the means of supporting life, remedies for the recovery of health, helps towards convalescence; the state is perpetuated by marriage and maintained in peace and order by the care of the government.[1]

[1] P. iii. q. 65. a. 1.

The spiritual society has the like needs, and in the sacraments it has corresponding succors. We are admitted into its bosom by Baptism; through confirmation we gain growth and strength; the Eucharist supplies our true food; penance the more salutary remedies for the sicknesses of the soul. Extreme Unction is to restore us to the society of the faithful from which we have been separated by sickness, or admit us by a holy death into the blessed society of the blest. Marriage perpetuates the Christian family; and in the christian commonwealth, the sacrament of order as its name implies, establishes order, and harmony, and perpetuates the Priesthood, the sacrifice, the authority of Jesus Christ.

Whatever may be thought of these analogies, of which the Council makes no mention, and which are not alleged as proofs, it is certain that the most ancient Rituals and Euchologies that have been discovered among the Latins, the Greeks, the Armenians and other Eastern nations, who have been separated from the Roman Church for many centuries, mention every one of these seven sacraments. The Greeks call Baptism, *Regeneration*, Confirmation, the *Chrism*, the Eucharist an *Oblation*, Penance the *Canon*, Extreme Unction *the anointing of the sick*, and marriage the *crowning of the spouses.*

Now, says St. Augustin, that which has been held by the whole Church, from the most remote antiquity, without having been established by Councils, ought to be regarded as an Apostolical Tradition.[1]

Further, the Greek and Latin Fathers mention and recommend, sometimes one, and sometimes another of these sacred signs; but though all do not speak of all the seven, yet the seven are nevertheless mentioned, described, commended in their writings considered as a whole.

We will not insist on Baptism and the Eucharist which Protestants still, like ourselves, regard as sacraments. Confirmation is spoken of by Tertullian, Pope Cornelius,

[1] De Bap. Con. Donat.

St. Cyprian, &c. ‖ Origen, Tertullian, and the Fathers who wrote against the Montanists and Novatians maintain the power of the Church in the Sacrament of Penance.

St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, and those who contended against the Donatists and Aërius, indicate the Sacrament of Order from the attacks directed against it. Origen, Victor of Antioch, St. John Chrysostom, &c., mention Extreme Unction. Lastly, St. Ignatius, the martyr, Tertullian, St. Justin, &c., speak of Christian marriage as a sacrament.[1]

But let us end this examination by some decisive considerations. In 1124, St. Otho of Bamberg, the Apostle of Pomerania, explains the doctrine of these same sacraments, still seven in number. A Council held at London in 1237, reckons seven sacraments. This is the number mentioned, as transmitted by tradition, by Peter Lombard, Alan de Ryssel, and other schoolmen. We find the same teaching and the same faith on this point among the Greeks, the Copts, the Jacobites and the Armenians.

Cyril Lucas, Patriarch of Constantinople, but a simoniacal, intruded heretical Patriarch, gained over by the gold of the Dutch calvinists, sent them a profession of faith in entire conformity with their innovations. The 15th article declared that the Greeks received only two sacraments, Baptism and Eucharist. As soon as this false testimony and base apostasy became known, the whole of the East was in excitement: in the year 1635, the clergy of Constantinople protested against this calumnious imputation in a document which the Proto-Syncellus dedicated to all the archbishops, bishops and priests of the Greek rite; afterwards in 1638, in a council convoked at Constantinople, and composed of three patriarchs, twenty-one bishops, twenty-three dignitaries of the Greek Church, Cyril was condemned in the following terms; without any objection being made: "Anathema to Cyril, the inventor of new dogmas, pretending that there are

[1] See Rendaudot, *la Perpetuite de la foi de l'Eglise sur les sacraments.*

not in our Religion, by the institution of Jesus Christ, the tradition of the Apostles, and the perpetual practice of the Church, seven Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Marriage; and carrying imposture so far as to say that, according to the Gospel, there are only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist." Four years after, two other councils, the first convoked at Jassi, the second at Constantinople, renewed this anathema.—Lastly, towards the end of the seventeenth century, a council held at Jerusalem, under the patriarch Dositheus, professed its belief in the following words: We believe that in the Church there are seven sacraments of the gospel, neither more nor fewer; and that it is an act of malicious, false and insane heresy to add to this number or to take away from it.

Let us now see what is the efficacy of these precious instruments of salvation.

IV.

Efficacy of the Sacraments.

The Sacraments of the New Law, for the question at issue between the Protestants and ourselves, regards these alone, confer grace by virtue of the act performed, *ex opere operato*, as theologians express it, that is to say, by a virtue which the institution of Jesus Christ has appropriated to, and made inherent in the act done.

Leibnitz compares this efficacy to that which due legal formalities give to certain contracts, to a testament for instance.[1] Suppose the testator to have the will to transfer the ownership of his property and the legal capacity for making a testament, and the person to whom he bequeaths it to have the will to accept the succession and the legal capacity for receiving it, and that the testament itself has all the legal formalities required, at once by the supreme will of the law the property is transferred.

[1] Syst. Theol., *De Sacram.*

So if we suppose in the *minister* of the sacraments the power and the will to confer it, in the *recipient* the will and the fitness necessary for receiving it, in the *sacrament* itself the conditions required by Jesus Christ for its validity, at once the grace is given. The Divine liberality is pledged to it, God will perform His part always and towards all men. Baptism, for instance, will regenerate to the life of grace all the infants to whom it is duly administered. Every wafer will become the bread of life at the altar when the Priest has pronounced over it the words of our Lord, &c.

On the part of man, the only conditions required for his receiving sacramental grace are these: first, that if he be an adult, he should wish the sacrament to be administered to him, for assuredly, without wishing it, no adult could become a Christian, a priest, a husband; next, if it is a question of receiving *an increase of spiritual life* from one of the sacraments appointed for this end, as the Eucharist, Confirmation, Orders, &c., it is necessary that the recipient be *living* with that life, which it is intended to increase, that is to say, that he be *just*. Thus no grace is conferred by the Eucharist on the unhappy man, who receives it unworthily, and who by that profanation becomes guilty of a horrible sacrilege. But if it be a question of receiving either of the two Sacraments destined to give or to restore spiritual *life* to the sinner, Baptism or Penance, in that case the recipient, in order to be in a capacity to receive grace must bring the dispositions, which we enumerated when treating of the doctrine of Justification. There is no exception save for new-born babes who, not having sinned in their own persons, have no need to bring to Baptism personal dispositions

This doctrine, on the efficacy of the Sacraments, is founded on Scripture and tradition. Jesus Christ wills that *we* "*be born anew of water.*"[1] "He has saved us," says the Apostle, "by the laver (or bath) of regeneration."[2]

[1] Joan. iii. 5. [2] Tit. iii. 5.

"Be baptised, every one of you," said St. Peter to the Jews, "for the remission of sins."[1] The acts of the Apostles tell us that "the Holy Spirit was given by the imposition of hands."[2] The sins of those to whom you remit them, shall be remitted,"[3] said the good master in establishing the Sacrament of Penance; and in speaking of the Eucharist, "He that eateth MY FLESH and drinketh MY Blood hath everlasting life."[4]

I will cite one passage only from the Fathers. Tertullian, in these few lines mentions several sacraments, and you see the virtue he attributes to them. "The flesh is washed that the soul may be purified. The flesh is annointed that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed with the cross that the soul also may be protected; the flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of hands that the soul also may be spiritually enlightened; the flesh feeds on the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that the soul also may be nourished with God Himself."[5]

Catholic teaching attributes to three Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Orders, a special effect, called a *character*, which the Council defines thus: an indelible mark, impressed upon the soul, so that these Sacraments cannot be repeated. This character is rather the sign of a rank acquired, than a grace received; accordingly one who, from want of sufficient dispositions, should receive the Sacraments without the Sacramental grace, would not the less receive its *character*.

In the state, they distinguish three different orders or ranks, that of the *citizen*, of the *soldier*, of the *magistrate*. It is the same in the Spiritual Society.

"He who has received the Sacrament of Baptism, Confirmation, or Orders," says Leibnitz,[6] "has at the same time received a certain permanent quality, which cannot be validly and legitimately reiterated. In the

[1] Act. ii. 38. [2] Act. viii. 18. [3] Joan. xx. 23. [4] Joan. vi. 54.
[5] De Resurrect, Carnis c. 8. and see De Prœscript, c. xi.
[6] Syst. Theol. n. xliii.

civil law we recognize similar qualities, thus, for instance, suppose a citizen possessed of rights or a property which the law declares to be inalienable, such as the rights of the crown and in some countries territorial property; in that case, according to the principle that we cannot acquire what we possess already, this citizen will have in his right to these possessions a permanent quality which can neither be lost nor recovered. By Baptism we become Christians; Confirmation attaches us by a still closer bond to the Christian Society; Order makes us ministers of the Church. These qualities of subject, soldier, minister of Jesus Christ, are most assuredly permanent. They could not be alienated and consequently could not be recovered."[1]

V.

On the minister of the Sacraments.

It remains to speak of the minister who confers the Sacraments, and of the ceremonies employed in administering them.

In the Protestant system the Sacraments have no other effect than that of exciting faith, which alone causes justification. This principle being allowed, it follows that whoever by word or gesture can awaken the feelings of faith, is capable of administering the Sacraments, be he priest or layman, man or woman, angel or devil. Luther admits to this work *the Devil and his dam!*

As innumerable disorders resulted from this unlimited freedom which was allowed by the Lutherans, the Reformed portion declared that the Sacraments would only be administered by those who had received permission to do so from the faithful or from the sovereign.

The ancient Donatists, and at a later period the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the followers of Wickliffe and of Huss admitted, with Catholics of all ages and countries,

[1] See also S. Bonaventure Brevil. p. 6. c. vi.

that the sacraments produced grace; that they could be administered only by men raised to that function by Jesus Christ; but they made the effect of the sacraments depend on the goodness of the minister. If he was in a state of sin, they said, he could not confer grace which he had not himself.

The Catholic doctrine teaches that the Saviour instituted a special ministry for the conferring of the sacraments, and that He has made the efficacy of those sacraments wholly independent of the personal virtues of the ministers.

Such has at all times been the faith of the Church. She has always believed that the sacraments derived their whole efficacy from the merits of Jesus Christ. Hence those beautiful words of St. Augustine: "Be it Peter that baptizes, or Paul, or Judas, it is always Christ that baptizes. The grace is one and the same, notwithstanding the diversity of ministers, because it proceeds from the principal worker, Jesus Christ."[1]

It matters little, St. Augustine proceeds, whether the seed is committed to the earth by clean or unclean hands, it bears fruit all the same. So is it with the sacraments, whether they be dispensed by just or unjust ministers.

This grace, he says in another place, is like the water that flows through a conduit; it produces no effect upon the stone of the conduit, but it goes on out from it and fertilizes the gardens and the meadows. Or it is like the light which comes pure to our eyes, even though it has passed through unclean places to reach us.

St. Gregory Nazianzen uses a different illustration: Suppose, says he, that there are two seals bearing as their impress the same likeness of the emperor, the one of gold, the other of iron. Whether it is this or that which you apply to the wax, the impression which appears will still be the same.[2]

[1] Contra Crescon. II. c. xxi, n. 26. *De Baptismo*, l. iii. c. iv, n. 6., *de Unit. Eccl.* c. xxi. n. 58.

[2] Orat. xl, n. 25.

St. Augustine, in his refutation of the Donatists, brings out very clearly the inconveniences of every kind which result from their heresy. If the efficacy of the sacraments depended upon the personal virtues of the administrators, no one could be sure of having received a valid sacrament. I should not be sure of being a priest, nor you of being christians, or of being confirmed, or of receiving the divine Eucharist at the holy table. . . Instead of examining myself before receiving the sacraments, I ought rather to employ my time in examining the minister who confers them, in inquiring into his doctrine, his morals, his whole life. The result of such an inquiry would be that such or such a pastor, whom I thought pious, virtuous and consequently a legitimate minister of the sacraments, would appear quite a different person to the more sharp-sighted or malicious eyes of my neighbor. From this there could but arise incurable disquietudes and endless schisms; and schism would not be the greatest evil; for if we suppose a minister really unworthy, thenceforward there are no more sacraments for his parishioners, no more penance, eucharist or baptism; if he is a bishop, no more priesthood: christianity disappears, the church is annihilated.

What is necessary and what is sufficient in a minister of Jesus Christ, when conferring a sacrament, is that he act, in dispensing holy things, with the earnestness required in the administrator of human things. In order to his being believed to administer validly in the eyes of all men, it is necessary that he be awake; that he be not beside himself from delirium, madness or intoxication; that he act not in jest, or to ridicule, or counterfeit the sacrament, but seriously and with the intention of doing what the Church does. This is all that the Council requires.

VI.

On the Ceremonies used ir the administration of the Sacraments.

Let us see what the Council says, of the ceremonies which accompany the administration of the sacraments. These are defined to be, external, religious rites, instituted by Jesus Christ, the Apostles and the Church, in order that holy things may be administered with due pomp and dignity.

"They are," says Cardinal Bona, "outward religious acts, which remind the soul of the reverence due to the sacred mysteries; which raise it to the contemplation of things invisible; which nourish piety, give warmth to love, increase faith and strengthen devotion; they are an instruction for the simple, an adorning of divine worship, a means of preserving religion among the people, and of distinguishing true believers from infidels and heretics."

"The Church," says the Council, "has always had the right to make rules and modifications respecting the dispensation of the sacraments, such as it shall judge most conducive to the dignity of the sacraments themselves, according to the variations of circumstances, times and places, on condition, always, of not touching their substance."

We find this right exercised by St. Paul, when he says in his Epistle to the Corinthians,[1] after treating of the Eucharist: "The rest will I set in order when I come." "It was then," says St. Augustine, "that those rites were ordered which are observed without variation throughout the universal Church."[2]

In the second century, St. Justin, in his Apology for

[1] Cœtera cum venero disponam. 1 *Cor.* xi. 34.

[2] Hoc ipso ordinatum est quod nulla morum diversitate variatur. *Epist.* liv, *ad Januarium*, c. vi.

Christianity,[1] mentions fasting, prayer, immersion, as ceremonies practised at Baptism, . . and the kiss of peace, the acclamation, the prayers, the thanksgivings which accompanied the celebration of the Eucharist.

Tertullian, in his book on the Crown,[2] and the rest of the Fathers of the second and third centuries, speak of several other rites as received in the whole Church and established by the Apostles.

The Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called, and the most ancient liturgies of the East and West, agree in a wonderful way, as to the essential rites, and by their agreement prove the common origin of these rites. The most learned Protestants have established this.

Rites, therefore, serve as witnesses to tradition. They translate the most abstract truths of christian theology into popular language. They assist us in uniting our whole being to God, and speak, in God's name, to all the faculties of the soul, and to all the senses of the body. If you proposed to me a purely metaphysical way of adoring God, I should judge such a kind of worship very good perhaps for angels, but not sufficient for me; I, who am an intelligence ministered to by a body, have need that my mind, my heart, my imagination, my very senses should unite in sacrificing to the Lord. Besides, if sin has entered in, if it still besieges my whole body, is it not necessary that grace should penetrate, consecrate, sanctify the body wholly and entirely? And is it not in order to satisfy these necessities of my nature, that the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth? Now, since His triumphant Ascension, it is in His church that the Word made flesh has dwelt. Ever full of grace He pours it into our hearts through the sacraments; ever full of truth, He makes it heard by the infallible voice of the episcopate united to its head; and the penetrating harmony of religious chants, the poetry of sacred rites, the instructive and touching

[1] *Apol.* i. n. 64 and 65. [2] *De Corona*, c. iii. and iv.

array of ceremonies, the sublime creations of painting, sculpture, architecture, music, are for us, in Catholic worship, the echo, as it were, of the words of the God of truth, the charms of the God of grace, a near appearance of the incarnate Word.

Besides, those same Reformers, who made the institution of our ceremonies a reproach against us, soon assumed the right of establishiug ceremonies themselves. We read in the Preface to the Helvetic Confession: "The churches of Jesus Christ have always had free power to establish rites and ceremonies." And within these last few years, we have seen parishes in England resume rites long abandoned, and his Prussian majesty, with the assistance of his aid-de-camp, causes his own ritual and ceremonial to be adopted by five or six thousand Luthero-Calvanistic parishes. In the Confession of Augsburg and in the Saxon Confession they say, that it is a sin to violate religious rites so as to cause scandal or proudly to despise them, "it involves a want of respect for authority, an infringing of discipline, disturbing of the peace of the Church." The Council of Trent could not have expressed it better.

In what we are about to write, therefore, we shall describe in detail the ceremonies used in the administration of the Sacraments. Such a description, will of itself suffice to make their beauty appear.

In the fifth chapter of the fourth book of Kings, the following circumstances are related: Naaman was the general-in-chief of the army of the King of Syria; he enjoyed all the favor of his sovereign, immense riches, unbounded power, the well merited title of Saviour of his country, and with all this, alas! Naaman was a leper.

Now, a young Israelitish girl, the slave of his wife, said to her one day: Assuredly if Naaman, my master, had addressed himself to the prophet in Samaria, that man of God would have cured him of his disease.

Naaman reported these words to the king his master:

who sent him with letters of recommendation to Joram king of Israel, and also with ten talents of silver and six thousand pieces of gold and ten changes of raiment.

Joram accordingly received from the hands of Naaman a letter to this effect: "I send you my servant and minister, the bearer of this present, that you may cure him of his leprosy."

On reading this message, the king of Israel is grieved and indignant, and rends his garments and cries out, "Am I God to kill and make alive, that this man hath sent to me to heal a man of his leprosy? Wait and see how he seeks an occasion against me."

Eliseus, on hearing that Joram was thus in despair, bade him send Naaman to him.

The leper comes with all his equipage and a numerous attendance to see the prophet and stops before the door of his house. Eliseus, without going out, tells him by a messenger to go and wash seven times in the Jordan, and he should be cured.

Naaman, transported with rage, went away, saying, "I supposed he would have come out to me, and stood and called on the name of his God, and touched with his hand the place of the leprosy, and so healed me. Are not the Abana and the Pharphar rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel, that I may wash in them and be clean?"

However some of his servants came to him and said: "Father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, surely thou wouldst have done it? how much rather what he now hath said to thee: 'Wash, and thou shalt be clean.'" Naaman allowed himself to be persuaded, descended from his chariot, washed himself seven times in the Jordan according to the word of the servant of God, and came out cured, "his flesh was restored, like the flesh of a little child."

He then returned with all his suite to the prophet and standing before him said: "Now in truth I know that

there is no other God in all the earth but only in Israel, and henceforth I will not offer sacrifice to any other God than Him."

Apply this history to yourself, dear reader. Is it not possible, answer me frankly, that your conscience is unhappily stained by some sin? You may be distinguished, wealthy, powerful, learned, enjoy a brilliant reputation and extensive influence, and yet you may have this hideous leprosy in your heart. And after all what doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and loses his own soul? or what exchange shall a man give for his soul? There is on earth, however, a means of curing so great an evil, and this is found in Israel, that is, in the Church, in the hands of the prophet, the priest of Jesus Christ. Go then, not to kings, not to philosophers, not to the physicians of the body, still less to those pretended ministers of the Gospel, who cannot prove their mission either by evident titles, or by miracles. Go to the undoubted organ, the authorized representative of the Church; in order to cure you of your doubts, your prejudices, your anguish, your temptations, your sins. It will need no great discussions nor long controversies. He will perhaps simply say to you: "My friend, make your confession," or if you are not yet a Christian, "Prepare yourself for Baptism." Nothing but this: on your knees, . . . the sign of the cross. . . . I confess to Almighty God, &c. . . . telling your sins, with sincere repentance. . . . Some drops of water on your forehead, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. . . . and let no one be grieved or in doubt, because the remedy is so easy and so simple. The Lord, our God, could call the world into existence out of nothing, and give it life by the death of His dear Son. He who can infuse into simple herbs a virtue that gives health to the body, can also impart to a few drops of water the power of regenerating the soul: for this very reason that the cure is made so easy for you, it would be absurd, inexcusable to refuse

it. Come then, dear Naaman, descend from your lofty chariot, plunge into the bath of penitence; return to it, if need be, twice, thrice, even seven times. . . . You will recover the health of your soul, and therewith happiness and joy; and you will recognize, by the sweet experience of His goodness, that there is no God in all the universe worthy of your adoration and your sacrifices but the God who is adored by the one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church.

VII.

Canons of the Council.

On the Sacraments in general.

Canon I. If any one saith,[1] that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation,[2] the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema.

Canon II. If any one saith, that these said Sacraments of the New Law do not differ from the Sacraments of the Old Law, save that the ceremonies are different, and different the outward rites; let him be anathema.

Canon III. If any one saith, that these seven sacraments are in such wise equal to each other, as that one is not in any way more worthy than another;[3] let him be anathema.

Canon IV. If any one saith, that the Sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous; and that without them or the desire thereof men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification; though all be not indeed necessary for every individual;[4] let him be anathema.

Canon V. If any one saith, that these sacraments were instituted for the sake of nourishing faith alone; let him be anathema.

Canon VI. If any one saith, that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify;[5] or that they do not confer that grace on those, who do not place an obstacle thereunto; as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Chris-

[1] Council of Florence. Decree of Eugenius to the Arminians
[2] C. Ad abolendam de Hæret.
[3] C. Nihil, De Cons. dist. II. and the like.
[4] Above, sess. vi. *on justification*, c. III. and Can. VII.
[5] Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV, *Decree of the Sacraments.*

tian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers; let him be anathema.

CANON VII. If any one saith, that grace, as far as God's part is concerned, is not given through the said sacraments, always and to all men, even though they receive them rightly, but (only) sometimes, and to some persons; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII. If any one saith, that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed (ex opere operato), but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace; let him be anathema.

CANON IX. If any one saith, that in the three Sacrments, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation and Order, there is not imprinted in the soul *a character*,[1] that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they cannot be repeated; let him be anathema.

CANON X. If any one saith, that all Christians have power to administer the word and all the sacraments;[2] let him be anathema.

CANON XI. If any one saith, that in ministers, when they effect, (conficiunt,) and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does;[3] let him be anathema.

CANON XII. If any one saith,[4] that a minister being in mortal sin,—if so be that he observe all the essentials, which belong to the effecting (conficiendum) or conferring of the sacraments,—neither effects or confers the sacrament; let him be anathema.

CANON XIII. If any one saith, that the received and approved Catholic rites of the Church, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be contemned, or without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers, or be changed by every pastor of the Churches into other new ones; let him be anathema.

[1] See sess. XXIII, Can. IV. Taken from the decrees of Eugenius IV. in the Council of Florence.

[2] See IV Council of Carthage, c. LXXXIII, and Council of Constance, art. XIII. of John Wicklef.

[3] See further on, Sess. XIV, *on Penance*, c. VI.

[4] Council of Florence, decree of Eugenius IV. The same error is condemned in Wicklef by the Council of Constance, Sess. VIII. C. *Multæ*; C. *Remissionem*, C. *Christus*, and many others, 1. g. 1. c. ult. XV. C. ult.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

Of Baptism.

Seventh Session of the Council

I

Reason of the Institution of Baptism. The matter, form, minister, effect, necessity of it. Irrevocable obligation contracted thereby.

An important person of the sect of the Pharisees, a ruler of the people, called Nicodemus, came to see Jesus, not openly, but under shade of the night[1] and greeted him as a teacher sent by God, whose miracles attested His heavenly origin and mission. Verily, I say unto thee, said Jesus, that no man can see the kingdom of God, unless he be born again. And how replied Nicodemus, how can a man, a full grown, an aged man, be born again? Can he enter into his mother's womb in order to come forth from it again? Jesus, insisting on the necessity, and explaining the mode of this new birth, or regeneration, answered: Verily, verily, I say to thee, no one can enter into the kingdom of God, unless he be born again, receive a new birth, of water and of the Holy Ghost. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Wonder not that I said to thee, you must be born again!

This necessity of a new birth, a regeneration, in order to pass from the empire of sin into the kingdom of God, is a consequence of our original fall. But what is the process according to which this supernatural life is given us:

The Son of man dwelling in heaven, from which He descended and to which He has again returned,[2] shall tell

[1] Joan. iii. [2] Joan. iii. 13.

us; "The Spirit breatheth where He will; no one knoweth whence He cometh or whither He goeth:"[1] He it is that shall cause you to be born again; and water will be the sign and the instrument of your regeneration by the Spirit. Water is the element, which purifies; it is the condition of growth and development, it was the submersion and the death of a guilty world. The earth, says St. Cyprian, remains unproductive until it is watered by the rain from heaven. The Hebrews, says S. Basil,[2] do not pass from slavery to freedom, from exile to their true Country except by going through the waves of the divided sea. Three immersions were to represent at once the burial of the old man in the tomb where Jesus Christ was laid for three days, the cleansing of the Soul, and the resurrection of the new man. Water then will be chosen as the symbol of these mysteries; and in the regeneration of the world as in its first creation the *Spirit of God* will hover over the water, to make them life giving.[3] The Sacrament which will cause us to be born again will be Baptism.

Under the empire of "the will of the flesh, in the name and by the powers of man"[4] the blood of Adam had animated us with a life which was disinherited, polluted, despoiled of grace and condemned to perish. Such had been our carnal generation; the Spiritual will be accomplished in a manner analogous but opposite.

In the name and by the will of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the blood of Jesus Christ or the water which flowed from His opened side, poured in to our soul in order to wipe away all sin there, will animate it with a heavenly, an immortal, a divine life. From that living tomb, which he calls his mother's womb, man had come forth a sinner. He must as quickly as possible

[1] Joan. iii. 8. [2] *Hom. in S. Baptisma*, n. 2

[3] Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas. *Genes.* i. 2.

[4] Ex sanguinibus et ex voluntate carnis et ex voluntate viri. *Joan.* i. 13.

be plunged in the lifegiving tomb of Jesus Christ to draw thence from His Blood, resurrection and immortality.

Thus, as Moses lifted up the brazen serpent in the desert, that the sight of it might recall to life the Israelites, who had been mortally wounded, God has so loved the world as to sacrifice His only begotten Son, and He is to be lifted up upon the cross to give to those who shall believe in Him and be baptized in His Blood a preservative against everlasting death and a principle of immortal life. Such is the conclusion of our Saviour's discourse to Nicodemus.[1] The Fathers agree in recognizing a distinction between this baptism of our Saviour and that of John. This last, even according to those who exalt its virtue most highly, as St. Cyril, St. Basil, and others, did not give the Holy Spirit nor the title of children of God, nor the hope of a Blessed Resurrection. St. Augustin, St. Jerome, St. Athanasius, St. John Chrysostom, and Tertullian deny that it had the virtue of remitting sins.[2]

Water has always been regarded in the Church as the matter of Baptism, which was called by the Fathers, the Sacrament of Water, the Sacred fount, the well-spring of life, the bath of regeneration. "See here is water," said the Ethiopian to Philip, "what doth hinder me from being baptized?" "What is the baptism of Christ," asks St. Augustine, "water which purifies by a word. Take away water, there is no Baptism. Take away the word, there is no Baptism."[3] All the Rituals, all the Pontificals, all the Euchologies of the Greek and Latin Churches are unanimous in requiring water, pure and natural, for Baptism. However, though water is absolutely necessary, immersion is not. The Church has at

[1] Joan. iii. 14 and following verses.

[2] Augustin, *de Bapt. cont. Donatistas*, l. v. c. xi. n. 12; *Hieron. cont. Lucifer;* Athanas. *in Matth.* iii. 11; Chrys. *in Act. Apost. Hom.* xl. 2; Tertull. *de Baptismo*, c. x.

[3] Quid est baptismus Christi? lavacrum aquæ in verbo. Tolle aquam, non est Baptismus. Tolle verbum, non est Baptismus. *In Joan.* tr. xv.

all times regarded as equally valid, baptism by immersion, by affusion, or by aspersion (by pouring or sprinkling the water on the person). Immersion is a more expressive sign ; but the greater or less expressiveness of the sign, so long as its substance is preserved, is a question of discipline, of which the Church is judge. It is certain from records which go up to the most remote antiquity, and it is admitted by the most zealous advocates of immersion, that the sick have always been baptized by affusion. This practice prevailed at Rome from the sixth century. The Orientals and the Greeks often use this manner of baptizing.[1]

The Roman Ritual, approved by Pius V, approves both ways of baptizing. The necessary form of Baptism, as every one knows, consists in the words: "*I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" In the Greek Church they say: "*This servant of God is baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" On this point again all the Fathers, all the Councils, all the Rituals are unanimous.

Tradition teaches us further, that Jesus Christ being the principal minister of Baptism, He employs as His instruments, not Bishops and Priests only, but, in case of necessity, laymen and even women. Thus Ananias baptizes Paul; Zephora had circumcised her son. *Et laicis est jus baptizandi*, said Tertullian.[2] The prohibition of baptism by women, always excepted cases of necessity. Baptism even by heretics is valid, provided they do not essentially alter either the matter or the form, and have the general intention of doing what the Church does, or what Jesus Christ instituted. This point of doctrine having met with some contradiction, St. Stephen, the Pope, ordered the bishops of Africa and Asia Minor to adhere to the ancient belief and practice under pain of excommunication; and this measure, according to the

[1] *Recherche sur le Bapteme, par Cretin*, p. 27.
[2] *De Bapt.* c. xvii.

testimony of St. Dionysius, reduced all the Churches to unity on this most important question.[1]

Baptism, according to Scripture and tradition, is the means of our being cleansed from original sin, from all the sins which we had committed before our regeneration. Accordingly our Saviour said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."[2] The effects of Baptism are, according to the Scriptures, "the washing and cleansing of the soul, our being born again, our union and incorporation with Jesus Christ."[3] "Let every one of you," said St. Peter to the Jews, "be baptized in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins."[4] "Rise up," said Ananias to Paul, "and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, invoking the name of the Lord."[5] The Apostle, in his turn, says to us, that "by Baptism we are buried with Jesus Christ, so as to die with Him, and then to live again with a new life, as He was Himself raised from the dead by the glory of the Father."[6] "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins," said the Council of Constantinople.

"We go down into the water," said St. Barnabas, "full of sins and pollution, and we come up from it bearing in our hearts the fruits of fear and hope."[7] Hermas also says, "We go down into the water, and we receive the remission of all our sins."[8] "There are no sins, however grievous and many we may suppose them to be, which can withstand the power of Baptism," say St. Justin,[9] St. Jerome,[10] St. Chrysostom,[11] St. Ambrose.[12] At the same time this sacrament remits all the penalty due to sin, as all the ancients teach. It is also the necessary introduction to all the other sacraments. "While water outwardly exhibits the sacrament of grace," says St. Augustin,[13] "the Spirit produces the benefit of that grace within,

[1] Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. 5.
[2] Marc. xvi. 16.
[3] Gal. iii. 27; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 26, etc.
[4] Act. ii. 38.
[5] Act. xxii. 16.
[6] Rom. vi. 4.
[7] *Epist.* n. xi.
[8] *Mandat.* iv.
[9] *Apol.* i. 61.
[10] *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Ocean.*
[11] *Hom.* i. *in Act. Apost.* n. 6.
[12] *De Sacram.* lib. iii. c. 1.
[13] *Epist.* xcviii. 52.

it delivers from the bond of guilt, reconciles nature, and regenerates in Christ the man that had been generated from Adam." "It is a creation," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "more divine and more exalted than the first." A homily bearing the name of St. Chrysostom enumerates the previous effects of Baptism in these beautiful words. "You were lately captives, now you enjoy the pure light of liberty; you were strangers and wanderers, you have now the rights of citizens in the Church; you were in the confusion of sin, now you are in the happy condition of the just: not only free, but pure; not only pure, but just: not only just, but sons: not only sons, but heirs: not only heirs, but brothers and co-heirs of Jesus Christ: not only His co-heirs, but His members: not only His members but His temple: not only His temple, but the organs of His Spirit: see what you owe to Baptism.[2]" At the same time that he refuses to admit the regenerating power of Baptism, Cretin allows that the whole of Christian antiquity without any exception believed it.[3]

Rendered so easy and at the same time so efficacious, Baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation, as Jesus Christ expressly teaches by these words, "Unless one be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."[4] To prove the perpetuity of this belief, we might cite Hermas, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, &c., as well as the strange practice with which certain heretics are reproached of baptising the dead or being baptised for the dead, the invectives of St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. John Chrysostom, against those who delay their baptism, &c.[5]

The Fathers therefore wished that Baptism should be

Orat. xl. 7, *de Bapt.*

[2] *Hom. ad Neophytos.* in append. ad tom. iii.

[3] *Recherches sur Bapteme*, p. 60 and 61. [4] Joan. iii. 5.

[5] Hermas, simil, ix; Iren. *adv. Hæres.* lib. v. c. 15, 13; Tertull. *de Baptismo*, c. xiii; Basil *de Sp. Sancto*, c. x. n. 26; Ambros. *de Abraham*, l. ii. n. 79; Greg. Naz. Or. xl. (244) *in S. Bap.*; Greg. Nyss. and Chrysost. *contra eos qui differunt Baptisma.*

given to infants; and Origen and St. Augustine declare that this is an *Apostolic* usage. To the same effect is the language of the Councils of Eliberis, of Milevis (416), of Gerunda (517), of Mâcon (585), of Wessex (690), and of several others. Adam had been able to do harm to these poor infants and to cause the germs of death to flow in their veins; why should not the blood of the new Adam have the power of regenerating them? Why should not Jesus Christ who, from His mother's womb, made His Precursor leap with joy when he also was still unborn, why should not he be able to restore to these new-born babes original justice and holiness? Is God no longer able to do for His children of Adam, some moments after their birth, what he did for Adam at the moment of his creation?

We see the Apostles baptize whole families: that of Lydia, the seller of purple,[1] that of Stephanas,[2] that of the gaoler at Philippi,[3] and that of Crispus;[4] is it not probable that there were infants in these families?

In the time of St. Cyprian a certain bishop, named Fidus, maintained that Baptism ought not to be given to infants till the eighth day after their birth: St. Cyprian assembled a Council at Carthage to discuss this position, which was condemned by all the bishops. "The grace and mercy of God," said the Council, "ought not to be refused to any child of man born of men, for as the Lord said in the Gospel: The Son of man is not come to destroy men's souls, but to save them; so, as far as depends on us, no soul is to be lost by useless delays."[5]

At a later period, the Pelagians, who denied original sin, were convicted of error by the simple fact that throughout the whole Church infants were baptized. "Such," said St. Augustin, "has been the constant and unvarying practice of the Church; it has received it from the first Christians, and it will preserve it to the end."[6]

[1] Act. xvi. 15. [2] 1 Cor. i. 16. [3] Act. xvi. 33. [4] Act. xviii. 8.
[5] S. Cyprian. Epist. lix. [6] Serm. 176. De Verbis Apostoli, n. 2.

Martyrdom alone supplies the place of Baptism. Some of the Fathers, however, recognized, with St. Ambrose, a Baptism *of desire*. But St. Augustine observes that this efficacy of a real and sincere desire to be baptised, and of blood shed for the faith, ought not to make any one neglect ordinary Baptism, when he is able to receive it.[1]

One of the advantages of Baptism, of which it is necessary to remind our unbelieving age, is the protection which the doctrine of its absolute necessity affords to the human being at its birth.

We remark with horror, in the history of the nations, ancient and modern, who have not been enlightened by revelation, a really monstrous contempt for the infant just coming into life. Lycurgus orders it to be exposed at the feet of the magistrate, who should pronounce the sentence of life or death. Aristotle, in his Republic, would have a law which should condemn to death every infant of weakly or delicate constitution, and should determine beforehand the number of children to be reared.[2] Plato, "the divine Plato," considers this arrangement very natural and very politic. The Gauls, says Cæsar, had the right of life and death over their wives and children.[3] The manner in which this barbarous right was exercised among the Romans was this: as soon as an infant saw the light, it was exposed at the feet of its father. On a sign given by him, it was immediately thrown into a sewer, or given to the pigs; on a more fatherly sign, it was taken up from the ground and preserved in life; and it is from this usage that we derive our word for bringing up children (élever), to express *the forming them for life*. Among pagan nations of old we only see the Germans and Egyptians who appear to have been more docile to the inspirations of nature.[4] As to the Jews, says Tacitus, they regard

[1] De Baptismo. l. iv. c. 22. n. 29.
[2] Politic. l. vii. c. 14.
[3] De Bells Gallico. l. vi. c. 19.
[4] Tacitus *de moribus Germanorum* § 19.

the killing of their supernumerary children as a crime.[1] Even in our own days, almost everywhere, beyond the limits of christendom, the infant is a victim sacrificed to every passion. Among savages, the father is master of the life of his children. In New Caledonia, the parents themselves often eat them. The Chinese, the most civilized of heathen people, sacrifice their children by thousands every day, and the object of our "Œuvre de la Sainte Enfance" is to snatch these unhappy creatures from death. In many provinces of the Celestial Empire, one daughter only is preserved in each house; in others they do not preserve any, and the young men when they marry are obliged to buy wives from the neighboring provinces. The number of children sacrificed every year in the town of Pekin alone amounts, we are assured, to ten or twelve thousand.

But whence is it that Christians derive that religious reverence for the infant, which is unknown elsewhere? Undoubtedly from the whole body of our doctrines and precepts, but in particular from the dogma of the necessity of Baptism. The infant dying without being regenerated is for ever excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Supernatural life was not due to it, as a right, and it will not be given. No injustice has been done the infant; but it is deprived of an immense benefit, which is essentially gratuitous, *Gratia Dei vita æterna.*[2] It ought therefore to be guarded with the most watchful care, even before its birth, and as soon as possible presented, at the baptismal font. Baptism is however administered solemnly under the eyes of the Church, in presence of witnesses and of two adoptive parents, who ought in case of need to supply the place of the natural parents in educating the new Christian; his name is inscribed in the registers of the Parish, he is henceforward guarded by an angel from heaven. To attempt his life, would be to wound the whole Church in one of its members, and to commit a

[1] Nefas putant adnatos occidere. *Hist.* lib. v. [2] Rom. vi. 23.

crime, the absolution of which is reserved to the Bishop. And if poor parents, if unhappy victims of seduction cannot support their children, Christian Society collects them, adopts them, opens asylums where they will be supported, schools where they will be educated.

If then, through so many chances of destruction as it has run for six thousand years past, life has come down from Adam even to ourselves, we are chiefly indebted for this blessing to this doctrine in appearance so severe, in reality so salutary, this doctrine of which we may say, as Voltaire said of God Himself:—

"If it did not exist, we should be obliged to invent it." In speaking of justification, we said that the preliminary obligation and indispensable condition of it was "a resolution to begin a new life and to keep the commandments of God." The baptized person submits therefore to the law and continues subject to it, to the whole law which Jesus Christ came not to destroy, but to raise to its perfection. As soon as the candidate presented himself at the door of the Church to receive Baptism, he was warned that for entering on the path of life, it was necessary to keep the commandments: *Si vis ad vitam ingredi, serva mandata.* By transgressing these divine precepts, he loses justice, and to recover it the remembrance of his baptism would not be sufficient; he would have no other means but that of a toilsome penance.

According to the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, baptism, as it impresses an ineffaceable character, can never be repeated. The adult who has with a deliberate purpose accepted the yoke of Jesus Christ, must bear it to the end, since this yoke is always truth for his understanding, justice and grace for his heart, and the condition of salvation for his eternal future. It is the same with one who has received the holy baptism a few hours after his coming into the world. When he becomes an adult, he is bound by the promises made in his name. Noble birth brings obligations with it. So the infant is

obliged by nature to respect and to obey his parents; so by the mere fact of his birth the citizen is subjected to the regular authorities that govern his country; so, and with much stronger reason the christian in virtue of the choice which the Lord has made of him, owes for ever his faith and his obedience to Jesus Christ and to the Church, His bride, who have given him his supernatural life. The authority charged by the Lord with the promulgation of His doctrine and moral law, ought so to possess the mind and the heart of the new born child, as never to leave place for doubt or hesitation, which would paralyse the impulses of grace, that propel him towards what is good, and would leave an open course for the passions. As the light of the sun insinuates and sheds itself on the eyes of the infant, without any attention, on his part, without any labor, without any effort of his, and causes him to perceive his parents with joy, and directs surely his first steps in life, so the Catholic faith, shining brightly on the eyes of all men "of good will," by its divine characters of unity, sanctity, perpetuity, &c., ought to make the lustre of its supreme authority appear at the first glance of his intelligence, and obtain his instantaneous and complete submission to the law of believing and acting. By this means all uncertainty is prevented, the evil instincts of nature may revolt, but the barrier is well fixed beforehand. The young Christian knows his "Father who is in heaven," and the commandments he ought to observe in order to please Him, and the way which leads to Him; his mind is enlightened and submits. His heart is gained, his conscience directed, his passions restrained; and owing to that supernatural preparation and predisposition for the faith which Baptism has introduced into his heart, and which is called infused faith, the work which gives him a moral constitution of truly divine perfection, is accomplished without any shock, without repulsion, imperceptbly indeed, but not less sweetly and gently

than the mothers appearance to her babe a few days after its birth.

Such are the unvarying principles of the Church of Jesus Christ on the institution, the nature, the necessity, the efficacy of Baptism, the dispositions which it calls for and the eternal obligations which it causes as to contract. It is sad to think that on all these points such doctrine and practice have been audaciously and, as it were in sport, overthrown, disfigured, trodden under foot by pretended reformers, to the eternal ruin of an infinite number of souls.

II.

Errors and variations of Protestants on the subject of Baptism.

"Better a thousand times," said a professor of Protestant theology,[1] "better a thousand times avow openly that you do not believe the Scripture, than profess to believe in it, while at the same time you deny the plain and evident meaning of Scripture." This reflexion, which seems to us most just, is perfectly applicable to our subject.

Jesus Christ says to us, in St. John, that the child of Adam must be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost,[2] from which words, says Cretin, the whole of antiquity concluded that Baptism regenerates and saves;[3] yet the great majority of our modern Protestants, including Cretin, refuse to believe in the regenerating virtue of Baptism!

Scripture knows no Baptism but that of which *water* is the matter, and Luther maintains that you may baptize with beer, milk, brandy, with any liquid whatever.[4] Calvin also believes that the baptismal water is a metaphorical water.

Jesus Christ would have baptism administered, *in the*

[1] Hodge, *Comm. on Romans*, t. 1.
[2] Joan. iii. 5.
[3] *Recherches sur le Bapteme.*
[4] Table Talk.

name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin, however, decide that the Baptism is valid, whenever words are employed, provided that they excite faith, and invoke not the name of man, but of the Lord.[1]

Our Saviour declares that without this new birth by water and the Holy Ghost, *no one can enter into the kingdom of God*, Calvin replies that this doctrine of the necessity of Baptism for salvation, deserves to be hissed at;[2] and in fact almost all the sects at the present day do hiss it down.

St. Luke tells us that Ananias, a simple disciple, by God's command baptized St. Paul. From this fact and the practice universally adopted since the Apostolic age, the Church has concluded that every man, in case of necessity, can give baptism. But our opponents have deduced from it that Baptism could only be administered in the temple and by the preachers of the Gospel.[3]

St. John declares that the Word made flesh "gives the power of becoming children of God, to those who are born not of blood nor of the will of the flesh or of man but of God Himself."[4] Hence Calvin and Beza concluded that children born of parents who have faith at the time of their birth, have no need of Baptism;[5] and the Synod

[1] De Captiv. Babylon., c. De Baptismo.

[2] Instit. l. iv, c. 15 and 16.

[3] That holy Baptism should not be administered except at the time of the sermon and only by the minister. *Ord. Eccles: of Geneva*, n. 38.

[4] Joan. i. 13.

[5] They endeavored to support their position by means of a text of St. Paul (1 *Cor.* vii. 14), which they interpreted according to their own fancy. St. Paul does not say that the children of a Christian wife and an unbelieving husband are pure from the original stain. If such were the meaning of the words *are holy*, it would be necessary to infer from them that the father himself, infidel though he be, is pure before God, for he is called *sanctified*. This word *holy*, opposed to *immundi*, signifies nothing more than legitimate. St. Ambrose, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, adopt this interpretation. Tertullian, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, understand the passage differently. According to them, *sancti sunt* is equivalent to *sancti erunt;* they will become Chris-

of Dort, in which all the states of Europe were represented, declared itself in favor of this opinion, which is clearly stamped with Judaism. Bullinger went still farther,[1] and of his own authority, dispensed with the Baptism of the children, grand-children, nephews and great-nephews of those who once in their life had believed in Jesus Christ.

The Apostle maintains that "they who are baptized into Jesus Christ put on Christ, as a garment,"[2] that is they pledge themselves to make His precepts and example the model of their life. This conformity to Jesus Christ constitutes that *new life* which, according to the same Apostle (Rom. vi. 4), we derive from Baptismal Regeneration. Hence Luther and Calvin conclude that Baptism emancipates us from the moral law;[3] that the mere remembering it blots out the sins committed subsequently to our receiving it; that it nullifies all vows made during, before or after it.[4]

Lastly, Jesus Christ has clearly ordered that we should baptize, that is, wash, purify. Now many of our modern Protestants, as if they could not utter a single word of the God of truth without falsifying it, even though they say, *I baptize thee*, profess not to wash anything at all, neither the body which they do not desire nor the soul which they do not expect to purify from their stains.

Let us repeat with our Professor: "Better a thousand times avow openly that you do not believe the Scripture, than profess to believe in it, while at the same time you

tians, if brought up by a Christian mother—they would remain pagans or unclean, if their mother, by separating from an unbelieving husband, were to leave them in his power. St. Augustine and St. Ambrose mention a third interpretation: *Sancti sunt, id est, secundum sanctas Dei et naturæ leges, quas infidelis a parte fideli servare docetur, sunt procreati. V. Bellarmin, De Baptismo.*

[1] *In* 1 *ad Cor.* c. vii.

[2] Gal. iii. 22.

[3] Luther, *De Captiv. Babyl. De Baptismo, Comm. in Epist. ad Galat.* passim.; Calvin, Instit. l. iii. c. 19.

[4] Luther, *De Captiv. Babyl.*; Calvin, *ir Antidot.*

deny the plain and evident meaning of Scripture." That which drives Protestants to these inevitable contradictions, is the fact that the doctrine of the efficacy and necessity of Baptism, so clearly established in our sacred Books, in the belief and practice of the whole Christian Church, refuses to be reconciled with their fundamental system of Justification by faith only. Now as they cling above all things to this accommodating theory, they are irresistibly impelled to deny all doctrines and all practices that are contrary to it.

"Luther was the only exception," says the Protestant author of the Enquiries about Baptism,[1] "and he maintains with his accustomed audacity this great paradox: that grace is only communicated through faith in Jesus Christ, and that nevertheless Water Baptism confers salvation and regeneration; and as he was too clever not to find out expedients, in order to cover appearances, he supposed that the prayers of the Church certainly communicated faith to the infant at the breast." Strict Lutherans continue to profess this doctrine at the present day, such are Martensen, Höfling, &c.

Zuinglius denied original sin and the regenerating virtue of Baptism. According to him, this sacrament is only a symbol representing the grace of divine adoption. Nevertheless he retained the Baptism of Infants, because, said he, we cannot prove from Scripture that it is forbidden.[2] According to him, this ceremony pledges the children to learn the law of God betimes and their parents to bring them up according to His will.

Calvin attempted an intermediate system between this and Luther's: with Luther he admitted original sin, and its condemnation passing by generation from father to son; he imagined that this condemnation was done away with, but only as regarded the elect, by the mere fact of their being born in the Christian covenant, that is, of Christian parents, and, in agreement with Zuinglius, he

[1] P. 160. [2] De Zwingle et de son epogue, *par* Hollinger, p. 224.

denied that Baptism had any virtue whatever to efface the original stain. However he retained the Sacrament, as a letter patent, signed and sealed by God, by which He informs, confirms and assures us that our sins are forgiven, remitted, covered and blotted out, and that they will never again be remembered.[1] Notwithstanding this declaration of the master, the Calvinist Liturgy supposes that the infant presented for baptism is still under the stains of its origin, for it says: "As he is offered and presented to thee by us, vouchsafe to receive him into Thy holy protection and to declare Thyself his God and Saviour by remitting to him that original sin of which all the posterity of Adam are guilty."

Socinus taught that Baptism had been prescribed for the Apostolic age only and that since that time it is useless. The Quakers went still further, and declared that Water-Baptism, far from being a duty, was hurtful. "There is but one Baptism," said Barclay,[2] "the holy and spiritual Baptism, which Scripture calls that of the Holy Spirit and of fire, which makes us die with Jesus Christ, purifies us from our sins, and makes us walk in a new way." Napoleon Roussel is of the same opinion.

"Pelagius was right," says the Dean of the Theological Faculty of Geneva,[3] "in asserting that the water of Baptism had not the power of cleansing the soul from its sin; that it was the sign of the purification of the heart, of the introduction of the Christian into the Church, and that infants dying without Baptism were not condemned." The teaching, which professes to be Evangelical, differs but little on this point from the national doctrine: "The most general opinion on Baptism," according to Nitzsch, is the following: that it was instituted by our Saviour "as a pledge and a seal that a man is received into the communion of a new life in Christ. . . What renders Baptism useless, is not its being adminis-

[1] *Instit.* l. iv. c. 15. [2] Essais, theolog. t. 1. p. 303.
[3] Cited by Mochler, Symbol. l. ii. § 68.

tered amiss or too soon, but the baptized persons neglecting the internal and external graces which ought to be its completion."[1]

"Baptism by itself is nothing," say the Archives du Christianisme,[2] "it only becomes a Sacrament by faith." As it is difficult to reconcile the system which puts all the efficacy of Baptism in faith, with the practice universally received in the Church of baptizing infants, Protestants by little and little departed from this ancient and precious discipline. As early as 1522, some enthusiasts at Wittenberg rejected the Baptism of new born children, which they called a bath for puppies. The Anabaptists condemned it, following Balthazar Pacimontanus, who declared that he had drawn his reasons against Infant Baptism from the writings of Luther. Storck would have all rebaptized who had received the holy water before they were adults. Servetus had to expiate at the stake his temerity in presuming to teach prematurely and without Calvin's permission, that Baptism ought not to be received before the age at which Jesus Christ received it, that is at thirty years. The Socinians ranged themselves under the opinion of Smalcius, "That a new born babe can become a disciple of Jesus Christ, is an absurdity just as incredible as that Jesus Christ should adopt a parrot or an ape."[3] The Arminians followed the Socinians in this view. The rationalists or modern Socinians, say with Dr. Balguy: "That we are born guilty is either incomprehensible or impossible. Baptism therefore is nothing but the figure or representation of our admission into the Church." But as one cannot logically enter into the church of free examination before the age of reason, persons are naturally led to conclude with M. Creain, "the Baptism of infants is entirely inconsistent with the command of the Son, the meaning of Baptism, the essential object at which it aims . . . . that this practice arose

[1] Sommaire d l'histoire des dogmes, by Merle d'Aubigne.
[2] Of April 12, 1845. [3] Contra Franzium, l. v. theol. Christ. n. 68.

in a departure from the doctrine of free salvation by Jesus Christ, and in the erroneous belief that the external signs communicated regeneration . . . . that except a small residue of Cathari, Albigenses, Waldenses and Patarenes, both Greek and Roman Catholicity had fallen (not only into this monstrous error) but into a second paganism."[1] The journal called "the Reformation" defends and propagates these theories. The debates of the Synod of Lausanne (1838) inform us that the opinion of Neander which is favorable to them, is widely spread in Germany, and may soon become common in Switzerland.[2] "The Baptists are multiplying," says M. Merle d'Aubigné,[3] "and, both in America and elsewhere, they maintain that those who have not received baptism by water as adults are not baptized nor are members of the Church of Christ." On the contrary, the Churches which have retained the practice of baptizing infants become every day more tolerant, after the example of the evangelical church of Geneva, whose constitution says: (Art. 19) "The church baptizes infants: but if she has within her fold brethren, who think it a duty to wait till a more advanced age for this rite, she does not hold that this difference ought to be a cause of division among her members." The numerous and solemn judgments pronounced in favor of M. Gorham by Queen Victoria and her councils, prove that in England, as in Switzerland and in Germany, faith in the sacrament of regeneration and in its efficacy for infants is daily declining.

In 1847, her Majesty nominated George Gorham to the benefice of Brampford-Speke. The Bishop of his district refused him canonical institution because he denied the efficacy of Baptism. Gorham appealed to the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which also condemned him; but he gained his cause before the Privy Council. The Bishop not considering himself beaten succeeded in

[1] Recherches sur le Baptême, pp. 157, 160. [2] Bulletin du Synode.
[3] Discours de M. Bourmier, p. 4.

bringing the case before the courts of law, by appealing from the Privy Council to the Court of Exchequer. But after three long days of stormy discussion, the lord Chief Bacon pronounced against him. Two Archbishops and eleven Bishops adhered to the sentence; one held that it should be accepted out of obedience to law; four declared themselves against it; six held silence; one declared that he would neither approve nor condemn. Out of fifteen thousand ministers, two thousand only protested. Dr. Philpotts therefore submitted to accept Mr. Gorham as Rector, and wrote to the inhabitants of Brampford-Speke, to the effect that he was certain that their pastor was a heretic, but that the law obliged him, and that he was amenable to the civil courts if he refused his consent. Proof that Anglicanism does not obey the word of God, but the law of man; that it does not submit to revelation, but to the sentence of the magistrates.[1]

We may then foresee that in a short time Baptism will be completely abandoned by the Reformation, and thus will perish for the most part that character of Christian, which the Protestant as yet preserves.

Assuredly Herod deserved the execration of all people, who in order to exterminate the Saviour of mankind, caused thousands of little children to be massacred in Bethlehem and its neighborhood, without (they say) respecting even his own child. A voice of lamentation was then heard in Rama; the voice of Rachel bewailing her dear little ones, and refusing to be comforted because they were not. They were no longer living, the joy of her heart, the life of her soul .... But they were all in heaven; the new-born God had baptized them in their blood and owned them as His first martyrs. But what will the Lord in His justice say to those blind guides, who not content with excluding themselves from the kingdom of God, daily drive from it thousands of others, and dry up the springs of salvation for innumerable generations?

[1] Le Monde May 6, 1860.

Herod made martyrs; these false teachers hinder the Church from making new Christians: Herod gave up the bodies of his victims to the sword of his executioners, these hirelings abandon to Satan millions of souls, whom the Saviour wished to snatch from his empire . . . and the Church, a desolate mother, from whom they take away these dear infants, who were her due, feels her heart torn, and utters cries more lamentable than those of Rachel, and with good reason refuses all consolation, because they are not . . . . The one consolation which she hopes for, at no distant future, is to see the schism ended, and all Christians henceforward have but one faith, one God, one Baptism.

Then will the most violent opponent of the Baptism of infants understand that he pronounced sentence on himself when he said:[1] "It is vain for man to fancy that he can do better than God. Whenever he has been so presumptuous as to lay his sacrilegious hand on the Divine work, whether he pretend to raise it up, or to simplify it, he can but leave on it the mark of what is in his power; that is, dishonor, and contempt, and destruction!!!"

Not the Sacrament of regeneration only, but Jesus Christ Himself must needs be very lightly esteemed by Protestants, when they admit the possibility of an adult Christian not ratifying the sacred engagements of his Baptism. Erasmus was of opinion that every one baptised as a child, should, when come to years of discretion, be called to examine whether he will continue a Christian or not. Does he still wish to belong to Jesus Christ? in that case he publicly reviews the profession of faith made on his behalf by his sponsors in Baptism. Does he declare that he renounces Christianity? He must be left perfectly free, and we must be content with withholding, from him the Sacraments, which he no longer desires. This system, adopted by Luther, renewed at a later period by Rousseau,

[1] Recherches sur le *Bapteme*, p. 184.

and by Feret, has become among Protestants the occasion of a ceremony, which they call *confirmation.* This is a course unknown to antiquity, opposed to good sense, insulting to Baptism, only calculated to suggest doubts to the mind, to remove all restraint from the anarchy of the passions in the heart, to persuade the young man just growing up that there is no authority on earth charged with teaching him the faith. It is to call him to undertake an examination of which he is completely incapable and on a question which can only be resolved, whatever be one's age, by the authority of the Church. It is to make the Christian submit to a trial insulting to Jesus Christ, a trial which they would take good care not to impose on their own son, as a member of the family, or in his character as a citizen; for they would look twice before they said to this youth: Examine whether this man and this woman, who say they are your parents, are really the authors of your life, and whether they have well-founded claims on your obedience. Examine again, young citizen, whether the laws of your country, which you have not voted for, are really just and obligatory on you. However, after all, this ratification of Baptism was but a necessary consequence of the principle of free examination and of the insufficiency of Baptism without faith. It was admitted. Rousseau, in his Emile, would not have his young pupil hear religion spoken of, before the age of eighteen. As Confirmation ordinarily takes place before that age, the consistent defenders of the fundamental principle of the Reformation cry out loudly for its abolition. "It is," exclaims a Protestant journal, "the most jesuitical, odious, abominable, institution! Every infant is baptized, and every baptized person is confirmed. Thus confirmation is a great sluice, always open, by which, every year, at the most sacred seasons and under the test of the most solemn recollections, all the pollutions of the world are turned into the Church. . . . Thus Protestantism is full of inconsistencies, and the Reformation is far from

having been faithful to its principles . . . all this is a monstrous, a fearful sham, it is the choicest work of the evil one. . . The remedy lies only in the abolition of the institution, which is not merely an abuse but a radical vice." When this remedy is universally applied, we shall without doubt see the Church flourish again: the world will be full of pious children, chaste young men, men and women fearing God! We already, especially in the United States, meet with old men brought up under this system, who say to you with the utmost seriousness: "If I ever choose a religion, I shall probably become a Catholic....."

It was the duty of the Council of Trent to condemn all these pernicious doctrines. It has done so in the following Canons:

III.

Seventh Session.

Canons on Baptism.

Canon I. If any one saith, that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ, let him be anathema.

Canon II. If any one saith, that true and natural water is not of necessity for Baptism, and on that account wrests to some sort of metaphor those words of our Lord Jesus Christ: *unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost:*[1] let him be anathema.

Canon III. If any one saith, that in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all the churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the sacrament of baptism: let him be anathema.

Canon IV. If any one saith, that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism: let him be anathema.

Canon V. If any one saith, that baptism is free (liberum), that is, not necessary to salvation: let him be anathema.

Canon VI. If any one saith, that one, who has been baptized, cannot, even if he would, lose grace, let him sin ever so much, unless he will not believe: let him be anathema.

Canon VII. If any one saith, that the baptized are, by bap-

[1] Joan. III. 5.

tism itself, *made debtors* but to faith alone,[1] and not to the observance of the whole law of Christ: let him be anathema.

CANON VIII. If any one saith that the baptized are freed from all the precepts, whether written or transmitted, of holy Church, in such wise that they are not bound to observe them, unless they have chosen of their own accord to submit themselves thereunto: let him be anathema.

CANON IX. If any one saith, that the remembrance of the baptism, which they have received is so to be recalled unto men, as that they are to understand, that all vows made after baptism are void, in virtue of the promise already made in that baptism, as if by those vows they both derogated from that faith which they have professed and from that baptism itself: let him be anathema.

CANON X. If any one saith, that by the sole remembrance and the faith of the baptism, which has been received, all sins committed after baptism are either remitted or made venial: let him be anathema.

CANON XI. If any one saith, that baptism, which was true and rightly conferred, is to be repeated, for him who has denied the faith of Christ amongst Infidels,[2] when he is converted unto penitence: let him be anathema.

CANON XII. If any saith, that no one is to be baptized, save at that age at which Christ was baptized, or in the very article of death: let him be anathema.

CANON XIII. If any one saith, that little children, for that they have not actual faith (actum credendi) are not, after having received baptism, to be reckoned amongst the faithful:[3] and that for this cause they are to be rebaptized when they have attained to the years of discretion; or that it is better that the baptism of such be omitted, than that while not believing by their own act, they should be baptized in the faith alone of the Church: let him be anathema.

CANON XIV. If any one saith, that those who have been thus baptized when children, are when they are grown up to be asked whether they will ratify what their sponsors promised in their names when they were baptized; and that in case they will answer, they will not, they are to be left to their own will; and are not to be compelled meanwhile to a Christian life by any other penalty, save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments, until they repent: let him be anathema.

[1] Gal. v. [2] C. *Majores*, § ult. *De Baptismo.*
[3] S. Aug. l. 1. *De Peccat. mer, et rem.*, c. 19. et l. III. c. 2.

IV.

Ceremonies of Bapism.

I promise to show those who are not acquainted with them the beauty of the Catholic rites. To put them before you in their sublime and grave simplicity, we need not recur to poetical descriptions. It is enough to repeat and to translate. What Commentary would be worth a text so visibly inspired?

Instead of the ceremonies which have been in use from the Apostolic age, as is proved by the testimonies of St. Justin Martyr, St. Cyprian, Tertullian, Origen, collected by Bellarmine,[1] our new reformers have substituted others of their own invention. Thus Calvin[2] would have Baptism administered on a Sunday, in the vulgar tongue, after the god-father and god-mother have promised to bring up the child in the Christian faith, and the minister had recited the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, etc. Luther did not venture to reject the renunciation of Satan, or the sign of the Cross made on the forehead and breast of the Catechumen. As for ourselves, we follow faithfully the pious rites transmitted to us by antiquity and their deep significance which we delight to study attaches us to them still more.

Although pure natural water is sufficient for Baptism, yet solemn Baptism is only administered with water previously blessed and consecrated. The water of regeneration, says St. Dionysius, is first consecrated by holy prayers.[3] St. Cyprian,[4] St. Ambrose,[5] St. Augustine[6] mention this consecration, which St. Basil calls an apostolic tradition.[7]

The following are some of the prayers by which it is

[1] *De Sacr. Baptismo*, c. xxv.
[2] In libello *De formula sacramentorum*
[3] Eccles. Hier. Cap. De Baptismo.
[4] Epist. lxx. ad Januarium, etc. [5] De Sacram. l. i. c. 5.
[6] In Julian. lib. vi. c. xix. n. 62. In Joan. Tract, cxviii. n. 5.
[7] De Spirit. S. c. xxvii.

accompanied. It is performed on Easter Eve, because by Baptism we rise again with Jesus Christ:

"Almighty Father, Everlasting God, who by Thy invisible power dost wonderfully work the effect of Thy Sacraments; and, unworthy though we be to perform so great mysteries, dost not forsake the gifts of Thy grace, but inclinest Thy merciful ears to our prayers. O God, whose spirit at the beginning of the world moved upon the face of the waters, that even then the element of water might receive a sanctifying power; O God, who in washing away by waters the crimes of a guilty world, didst make the very outpouring of the flood an image of regeneration; that in the mystery of one and the same element vices might be abolished and virtue spring up; look now upon the face of Thy Church, O Lord, and multiply Thy regenerations in her. Thou who by the floods of Thy grace makest glad Thy city, and openest the fount of Baptism through all the earth for the renewal of the nations; that by the command of Thy Majesty it may receive the grace of Thy only Begotten Son from the Holy Spirit; may that Spirit by the secret mingling of His light give fruitfulness to this water, here prepared for the regeneration of men; that from the immaculate womb of the divine fount, impregnated with sanctifying virtue, the heavenly offspring may emerge, born again as a new creature; and grace, as a mother, may bring them forth, in one and the same infancy, without distinction of sex or age. . . . . .

"I bless thee therefore, created element of water, by the living God, by the true God, by the holy God; by God whose word at the beginning separated thee from the dry land, and whose Spirit moved over thee; who caused thee to flow forth from the fountain of Paradise, and after being divided into four rivers to water the whole earth; who in the desert turning thy bitterness to sweetness, made thee wholesome and caused thee to flow forth out of the rock for His thirsting people.

"I bless thee also by Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord, who by a wonderful miracle at Cana of Galilee did by His own power turn thee into wine; who walked upon thee, and was baptized in thee by John in the Jordan; who made thee flow together with blood out of His own side; and gave commandment to His disciples that they who believe should be baptized in Thee, saying: Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

"Almighty God, in Thy clemency be present with us who are observing these thy commands; do thou mercifully breathe on us: bless with the breath of thy mouth this pure water, that besides its natural power of cleansing the body, it may have virtue also for the purifying of the soul . . . . . Let all the stains of sin be washed out here, let nature created to thy image and reformed unto the honor of its author, be cleansed from all its old pollutions, that every man who enters into this sacrament of regeneration, may be born again to a new childhood! &c."

Thus is the regenerating water prepared. Paul, the catechumen, instructed in our faith, prepared for baptism by repentance for his sins past and by amendment of life, admitted after several examinations, or at least on the judgment of the priest who has directed his instruction, Paul asks that the water may we poured upon him. The day is fixed: The Eve of Easter or that of Pentecost will be chosen by preference. Paul is led to the door of the Church, from which they who are still in unbelief, bearing the yoke of Satan, are excluded. The minister of Jesus Christ comes to receive him there; the question and answers which pass between them are as follows:

"What is thy name? Paul. What dost thou seek from the Church of God? Faith. What will faith obtain for thee? Eternal life. If thou wish to have eternal life, keep the commandments. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and thy whole soul, and thy whole mind, and thy neighbor as thyself. On these two

commandments depend all the law and the prophets. And faith is worshipping one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, neither confounding the persons not dividing the substance. For one is the person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost; but the substance of these Three is one, and their God-head but one."

After having summarily put the Christian law before him, the minister of Jesus Christ questions him on the principal doctrinal truths, for the Saviour said: "Go teach all nations and baptize them." Dost thou believe in God, the Father, &c.? A. I do. Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was born and suffered? A. I do. Dost thou also believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh and everlasting life? A. I do."

Then as of old Jesus Christ breathed on His Apostles, the priest breathes on the catechumen to expel the evil spirit, and to call unto Him the Holy Spirit. He then makes the sign of the cross on his forehead and on his breast, a ceremony of which St. Basil attributes the institution, to the Apostles,[1] and which is spoken of by St. Dionysus,[2] St. Augustine,[3] &c.

"Paul, receive the sign of the cross on thy forehead and on thy heart; have faith in the heavenly commands: let thy life be such that thou mayest henceforward be a temple of God: and entering the Church of God acknowledge with gladness that thou hast escaped the snares of death; abhor idols, repudiate images, worship God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; who will come and judge the living and the dead, and the world by fire. Amen.

"I entreat thee, O Holy Son, Almighty Father, everlasting God, that thou wouldst command the way of truth and of the knowledge of thyself to be shown to this thy servant, who is wandering in doubt and uncertainty, in

[1] De Spirit. S. c. xxvii. [2] De Eccles. Hier. c. De Baptismo.
[3] De catechizandis rudibus, c. xx.

the night of this world; that the eyes of his heart being opened, he may acknowledge thee the one God, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Ghost, and may obtain the fruit of this confession, both in this world and the world to come!"

Then signing with the sign of the cross the senses of the elect, that they may be opened to the Lord, and receive strength to fulfil His law, he says:

"I sign thy forehead, that thou mayest bear the cross of the Lord.

"I sign thy ears, that thou mayest hear the divine commands.

"I sign thy eyes, that thou mayest see the glory of God.

"I sign thy nostrils, that thou may smell the sweet odor of Christ.

"I sign thy mouth, that thou mayest speak the words of life.

"I sign thy breast, that thou mayest believe in God.

"I sign thy shoulders, that thou mayest bear the yoke of His service.

"I sign thy whole self, in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou mayest have everlasting life and live for ever and ever.

"O Lord, we beseech thee, mercifully hear our prayers, and guard this thy chosen servant, by the virtue of the Lord's cross, with the mark of which we sign him; that preserving the first elements of Thy great glory, he may by keeping Thy commandments deserve to come to the glory of regeneration.

"O God, who art both the creator and the reformer of mankind, be propitious to the people of thy adoption and inscribe this new offering in the new covenant, that the children of the promise may rejoice that they have received by grace, what by nature they could not have attained."

Then the priest, holding his hand over the head of the

elect, pronounces this prayer, which determines the meaning of the exorcisms and other ceremonies that follow:

"Almighty, everlasting God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to behold this thy servant Paul, whom thou hast been pleased to call to the first lessons of the faith; drive out from him all blindness of heart; break all the snares with which Satan had bound him: Open to him O Lord, the door of Thy mercy, that being imbued with the sign of thy wisdom (salt,) he may be free from all the ill savors of lust, and in the sweet ordor of thy commandments may joyfully serve Thee in Thy church, and advance from day to day, so that having received Thy healing care he may be made worthy to come to Thy grace of the Baptism, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

Jesus Christ said to His Apostles: "Ye are the salt of the earth," meaning by this that their supernatural wisdom was to prevent the earth from becoming corrupt, and to fill it with a divine sweetness. The minister of Jesus Christ in his turn says to the new disciple: "Receive the salt of wisdom, may it be to thee a propitiation unto life eternal. Peace be with thee." Origen and the third Council of Carthage speak of this ceremony.

After this come the exorcisms, which according to the testimony of St. Cyprian,[1] St. Ambrose,[2] St. Dionysius,[3] St. Gregory Nazianzen,[4] St. Cyril,[5] ought to precede Baptism. St. Augustine says that they were used in the whole Church.[6] Their object, says the Roman Catechism, is to drive out the Spirit of evil, to weaken and break his strength. Three times the catechumen prays upon his knees, three times he receives the sign of a cross as his armour, three times the priest adjures the hostile powers to abandon all dominion over this being who is henceforward to be guided by an Angel of heaven. Christ

[1] *Epist.* 76 *ad Magnum.* [2] De Sacram. lib. ii. c. 5.
[3] De Eccles. Hier. c. De Baptismo. [4] Orat. xl. in De Bapt. n. 27.
[5] Catech. i. [6] *De Nuptiis et Concup.* lib. ii. c. 18.

commands Satan—Christ is the conqueror. His minister taking the elect by his right hand, introduces him into the Church, saying, "Paul, enter into the holy Church of God, that thou mayest receive the heavenly benediction from our Lord Jesus Christ, and have a portion with Him and with His saints. Amen."

Paul, led into the presence of the holy altar, prostrates himself on the pavement of the Church, adores, then rises and repeats with the Priest, his guide and teacher, his profession of faith—the Apostles' Creed, and the form of prayer taught by Jesus Christ: Our Father who art in heaven!

Jesus Christ, in order to cure a deaf and dumb man, after wetting His finger with His spittle, touched the ears and tongue of the sufferer, and raising His eyes to heaven, sighed and said, Ephpheta! that is "Be opened!" After the example of the heavenly Physician, the Priest here repeats this ceremony on behalf of the spiritual sufferer to whom he is about to give health: but, instead of touching his tongue, he wets his nostrils and adds after: Be opened, "Unto an odor of sweetness."

Then, that he may be assured that his will absolutely repudiates that dominion of Satan, from which Baptism is to tear him, he demands a second time, according to a tradition already recognized in the times of St. Clement,[1] of St. Dionysius,[2] and of Tertullian.[3]

"Paul, dost thou renounce Satan?

A. I renounce him.

And all his works?

A. I renounce them.

And all his pomps?

A. I renounce them."

Then to represent that infusion of grace which is soon to make him a Christian, that is to say, anointed and consecrated, participating in the sovereignty, the priest-

[1] Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. 41, 42. [2] De Eccl. Hier. c. De Baptismo.
[3] De Spectac. c. 4; De Idol. c. 6. De Corona. c. 3.

hood, and the divine Nature of Jesus Christ, the priest, with the holy oil of the catechumen, annoints the elect of God on his head and between his shoulders, saying:

"I anoint thee with the oil of salvation, in Christ Jesus our Lord, unto everlasting life. Amen. Peace be with thee."

The catechumen is finally led to the Baptismal font. Here he renews his profession of faith, after which the Priest, in order to be assured of the freeness and firmness of his resolution, asks him.

"Q. Paul, what dost thou seek?

A. Baptism.

Q. Dost thou desire to be baptized?

A. I do desire it."

At this point the godfather and godmother come near their spiritual child; they support him while he bends his head over the font; and the minister of Jesus Christ, pouring the regenerating water three several times over his forehead; or, if such is the usage, plunging him three times in the sacred bath, pronounces at the same time the sacramental words: "Paul, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Paul is a Christian. While the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses his soul, divine grace pervades and inundates his heart. Accordingly the Priest, when anointing him on the head with oil mixed with balm, consecrated by the Bishop, called the holy chrism, can say to him with confidence:

"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has regenerated thee with water and the Holy Ghost, and has given thee the remission of all thy sins. Himself anoint thee with the unction of salvation in Christ Jesus our Lord, unto everlasting life. Amen.

Peace be with thee."

And covering him with a white robe, the symbol of innocence, he says to him: "Receive this white robe, and

mayest thou wear it without spot till thou come before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest receive everlasting life. Amen."

Then putting in his right hand a lighted taper, he says: "Receive this burning light and guard thy Baptism irreprehensible: keep the commandments of God, that when the Lord shall come to the marriage, Thou mayest meet Him in the heavenly halls unto everlasting life. Amen."

Lastly, he dismisses him, saying: "Paul, go in peace, and the Lord be with thee." "Amen," replies the Christian.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

On Confirmation.

Continuation of the Seventh Session.

I.

Institution of Confirmation: A Sacrament distinct from Baptism.

Our divine Master made a great promise to His disciples: that after His Ascension into heaven, He would send them the Paraclete, the consoling Spirit, who proceeds from Him as well as from the Father; the Spirit who is to make us understand all His teaching, and to console us in all our sorrows. This Spirit will speak before the persecutors, by the mouth of the confessors of the faith; He will bear testimony to the Son of God; the world cannot receive Him, He escapes their profane science and their carnal eyes, but the Disciples of Jesus will know Him, because He will be in them and will dwell in His Church for ever.

This promise has been fulfilled, without doubt; and in the same way as the Son of God, who was promised to the world from the beginning, gave Himself first to Christian humanity or the Church, conversing with her, during the course of His mortal life, and then to each one of the children of the Church, by Baptism and the Eucharist; so the Holy Spirit poured forth, the Day of Pentecost, on the Church assembled in the Upper Room, the Cenacle, since that time, gives Himself to each individual Christian, by a special Sacrament, which is called Confirmation.

The day on which the Holy Spirit came down on the

Apostles and disciples, they were confirmed in the faith, armed with extraordinary strength against persecution, enriched with the most precious gifts of heaven. Having up to that time been pusillanimous, ignorant, ambitious, always ready to leave their Master, to return to their boats and their nets, they are now full of the knowledge of doctrine, full of disinterestedness and intrepidity. They are willing to shed all their blood for the cause of the Crucified, whom but a little while ago they were denying at the voice of a serving woman. Just before, they were asking for the first place in the temporal kingdom of Jesus Christ; now they wish for no place except on the Cross. Lately, they did not at all understand His sayings: now they are able to comment on and to establish their truth. The *Sons of Thunder* are become gentle as Lambs. Simon Peter, to whom Jesus Christ said, but a few months ago: "Get thee behind me, Satan! thou art an offence for me: because thy thoughts are not the thoughts of God, but the thoughts of man;" this Simon Peter converted eight thousand Jews, in two discourses. Thomas, the most indisposed of them all to believe, will carry farther than any of the rest, the victories of the faith and the heroic constancy of martyrdom. Even if the Holy Spirit had not manifested His presence by any other prodigies, the marvellous change which was wrought in all these hearts, would be sufficient to show that, dating from this day, there was a new spirit which animated them, and that it was no longer the spirit of man, but the Spirit of God.

Now that the promise made by Jesus Christ has been fulfilled in a solemn manner for the new born Church, it must be carried out in perpetuity for each one of her children. The Spirit received by the dwellers in that upper chamber, is not communicated to their descendants by generation, it has nothing in common with flesh and blood. It is not bought by money, as that magician tried to buy it, who has left his name as a brand in the odious

name of *Simony*. This Spirit comes to us from heaven, by a regular means instituted by Jesus Christ Himself, always used in the Church, since the times of the Apostles, that is to say, by the Sacrament of *Confirmation*. Let us open the Acts of the Apostles, there we read:[1]

"When the Apostles who were at Jerusalem had heard "that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent "unto them Peter and John; who when they were come, "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; "for He was not as yet come upon any of them; but they "were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. "Then they laid their Hands upon them and they received "the Holy Ghost."

In this passage we may remark the *distinction between Baptism and Confirmation*: "They had not received the Holy Ghost; for they had only been baptized:" *The sacramental sign*, the imposition of hands; *the grace produced*; "they received the Holy Ghost;" *the minister of the Sacrament, not the deacon Philip* or the disciples who had baptized the Samaritans, but the Apostles.

At a later period[2] Paul finds at Ephesus certain disciples, that is, men really converted to the Gospel, and asks them: "Have you received the Holy Ghost?" and they answer (for they had not been sufficiently instructed): "We have not as much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost." The Apostle completes their instruction, baptizes them, and afterwards he lays his hands on them and they receive with the Holy Ghost, the gift of tongues and of prophecy.

St. Peter said to his hearers on the day of Pentecost, Jews and Proselytes: "Be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call."[3]

There are abundant testimonies to establish the agreement of tradition with our sacred books.

[1] Chap. viii. 14. [2] Act. xix. [3] Act. ii. 39.

St. Clement of Alexandria,[1] Tertullian,[2] St. Cyprian, place Confirmation in the rank of the Sacraments. "Our practice is," (says this last), "that those who have been baptised in the Church should be presented to the Bishops, that by our prayer and the imposition of hands they may receive the Holy Ghost."[3]

"We are called Christians," says Theophilus of Antioch, "because we are annointed with the oil of God."[4]

St. Ephrem,[5] St. Gregory Nazianzen,[6] St. Ambrose,[7] St. Chrysostom,[8] say that confirmation is a Sacrament, and that this Sacrament gives us the Holy Ghost.

Pope St. Cornelius, speaking of Novatian, says of this schismatic, that after his baptism he had not been presented to the Bishop, to receive from him the sacred seal, which alone gives the Holy Ghost."[9]

"The prelates of the Church," says St. Augustin, "still do what the Apostles did, when they laid their hands on the Samaritans and called down the Holy Ghost upon them.[10]

It is admitted by M. Merle d' Aubigny, that at this period Confirmation, Ordination and Marriage were classed among the Sacraments.[11] Moshiem, a more learned man, agrees that from the first century, the Bishops, while they permitted the presbyters to baptize, reserved to themselves the right of *confirming* the Baptism.[12]

St. Cyril of Jerusalem has devoted his twenty-first Catechesis to developing the Catholic doctrine on "*annointing*" or Confirmation.

The Fathers of the Councils of Eliberis, of Nice, and of Laodicea, as well as the authors of the Apostolic constitutions, refer to the same practice.

[1] *Strom.* l. ii. c. 3. [2] *Adv. Marc.* l. i. c. 14; *De Præscript.* c. xl.
[3] *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum;* lxxiv. *ad Pompeium.*
[4] *Ad Antylocum.* l. 12. [5] *Adv. Scrut. Serm.* vi. (*Serm.* xlxx.)
[6] Or. xxxiv. 14. [7] *De Sacramentis,* l. vi. c. 2. n. 8.
[8] Hom. xviii. *in Act. Apost.* n. 3. [9] Apud. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. c. 43.
[10] De Trinit. l. xv. 46. [11] Sommaire, p. 56.
[12] *Eccles. Hist.* 1st cent.

II.

Advantages of this Institution. Means to be used for drawing to us and preserving in us the spirit of God.

Confirmation then is a sacrament, distinct from Baptism, which gives the Holy Spirit according to the promise and by the order of Jesus Christ. Let us see what are the advantages of this holy Institution.

The first is the promotion of the christian from the rank of a subject of Christ, to that of a soldier; a promotion of which the signs will not appear by our garments being covered with material arms, but the remembrance and glory of which ought to be perpetuated by an ineffaceable character impressed upon our soul.

A second advantage, is a more distinct knowledge of the divine Persons, and particularly of the Holy Spirit. How many Christians might still say to us, as those disciples at Ephesus did of old to St. Paul:[1] "We do not so much as know whether there be a Holy Ghost," if they had not been obliged to receive special teaching, in order to prepare for confirmation! But teaching is not sufficient to give us a perfect understanding of divine things: in religion we only know well what practice has brought into the very depths of our souls. Nothing makes us know God like prayer, or Jesus Christ like Sacramental Communion, or the Holy Ghost, like the sacred anointing, which imparts Him to us.

The Bishop, being the sole ordinary minister of Confirmation, is by this very circumstance obliged to visit in person all the Churches, all the Parishes of his diocese, and to repeat these visits after the lapse of a few years. Each individual of the faithful has to appear before him, to reply to his questions, and in the most literal sense of the words, to *pass under his hands.* This obligation of giving and receiving confirmation is one of the causes which determine the division of the universal Church

[1] Act. c. xix.

into dioceses, and which decide the measure of their limits. It is, on the admission of all, one of the strongest bonds of diocesan and consequently of Catholic unity.

Thanks to this succor from on high, the critical age of transition from youth to manhood receives the armor necessary for withstanding the first assaults of the passions; the gift of *strength*, when the combat begins; the gift of *knowledge*, when the mind opens to an acquaintance with things sacred and profane; the gift of *counsel*, when a choice has to be made of the one good way out of all that present themselves; the gift of *wisdom*, when we have to discern and to enjoy true goods, by a supernatural instinct, rather than by the inspirations of reason. At the age at which confessing the faith becomes obligatory, God makes it easy to us. In the times of persecution it was by the holy anointing that the Christians fortified their hearts against the trials of martyrdom; in our day combats that are less bloody require no less courage and no less pressing succor.

But undoubtedly the first and most precious benefit of Confirmation is the gift which the Holy Ghost makes of Himself. Yes, the Spirit of God, the Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one and the same principle, the Spirit who, according to our sacred books speaks by the Prophets, works miracles, reveals the future,, fathoms the depths of God, diffuses spiritual gifts according to His own will . . . . the Spirit whose attributes are omniscience, omnipotence, supreme majesty, who works the sanctification of man, the resurrection of the body, &c., this Spirit is given to us.

When He was shed forth on the Apostles, He wrought by their ministry the renewal of the world. We have already recounted this great miracle, and reminded you of the conspicuous testimony which it affords to the Divinity of Jesus Christ. When the Holy Spirit is given to us, He comes to work similar prodigies within us. He comes into our hearts to sigh after our Father who is in

heaven, and to cry to Him, Father, Father![1] He gives to the youngest child in our schools an understanding of things divine which is superior to all philosophy; he makes us believe the incomprehensible, to love the absent good, sacrifice the present to secure the invisible future; He reveals Jesus Christ to us, gives us to taste the sweetness of His Gospel, makes us strong against ourselves, pure in a body of pollution, "free under the authority of law;"[2] He ceaseth not "to give testimony to our spirit that we are really the children of God."[3]

Up to the moment at which the Saviour entered into His glory, "the Holy Spirit had not been given,"[4] as the Gospel tells us; He had acted on the hearts of the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the just men under the ancient Law, but keeping at a distance, as it were, doing it from afar and only by His operations; while to us christians He is given not by grace only, but personally, as is said by St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Athanasius.[5]

He diffuses Himself in us, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem,[6] as the heat of the fire penetrates and pervades the iron put into the furnace; as a sweet scent attaches to our garments, when they have been in contact with aromatic herbs or a perfumed essence, said St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Athanasius;[7] as the wine imparts to the water with which it is mixed, its color, its taste, its spirituous qualities, said St. Maximus, the Martyr.[8]

He is in us, says St. Basil,[9] as form in matter, roundness, for instance, in a globe; and a power in the subject of that power, for instance, the faculty of seeing in a healthy eye; as his art in a skilful workman; as motion in a body projected into space; as a habit in him who has contracted it, profane love, for instance, in a heart possessed by creatures.

[1] Rom. viii. 15. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 17. [3] Rom. viii, 16.
[4] Joan. vii. 39. [5] S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xli. 11; *Comm. in Joan.*
[6] *Catech.* xvii. l. *de Spi. S.* l. n. 14.
[7] S. Cyril, *in Joan.* l. xi. c. 2. S. Athan. *Ep. I ad Serapion,* n. 23.
[8] Capit. *Theol. Hecat.* ii. n. 26. [9] *De Spir. S.* n. xxvi.

But it is not possible that the Spirit of God should establish His dwelling in a well prepared heart, without enriching it with innumerable treasures.

These precious favors, which the Holy Spirit brings us from heaven along with sanctifying grace, undoubtedly go beyond all our power of enumeration and baffle all our attempts at calculation; still among them theologians have distinguished *Virtues*, *Gifts*, *Fruits*, *Beatitudes*.

The *Virtues* are either theological or moral. Faith, Hope and Charity, the theological virtues, always accompany the Holy Spirit in the heart. If that rebellious heart repels the Spirit of God, charity departs with Him, and hope grows weak; faith continues still, deprived, however, of its brightness and its original energy, and ready itself also to abandon the poor soul, whose actions contradict his belief.

The moral virtues give perfection either to the mind or to the will of man. Four of them dispose the mind to the knowledge and love of truth: wisdom, understanding, knowledge, prudence: three dispose the will to avoid evil and to do good; these are justice, fortitude, temperance.

The *gifts* are supernatural habits which dispose the soul to practise the moral virtues, not in a common and mediocre degree, but in a very excellent and heroic way. As those virtues are seven, we must likewise reckon seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The gifts of wisdom, understanding, knowledge and counsel assist us in practising in an excellent way the virtues of wisdom, understanding, knowledge and prudence; and the gifts of piety, fortitude and the fear of God give us strength for practising perfectly the virtues of justice, fortitude and temperance. "Out of the root of Jesse," says Israel, "there shall come forth a branch, and that branch shall bear a flower on which the Spirit of the Lord shall rest, the Spirit that dispenses the seven gifts, "the Spirit of Wisdom and understanding, &c.[1]

[1] Is. xi. 1.

The acts of these theological and moral virtues and of the supernatural habitudes which we have named gifts, are called the *fruits* of the Holy Spirit. These acts are, in fact, produced in us by the Holy Spirit, just as good fruits are by a good tree. The Apostle enumerates twelve of them: "Charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, continency, chastity."[1] When the produce of these fruits is abundant and splendid, it is called a *beatitude*. Our Divine Master began the preaching of His gospel by proclaiming eight beatitudes: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, . . . the meek, . . . they that mourn, . . . they that hunger and thirst after justice, . . . the merciful, . . . the clean of heart, . . . the peacemakers, . . . they that suffer persecution for justice sake."[2]

Blessed, in short, are they that are animated and guided by the Spirit of God! for they, says the apostle, are the sons of God,[3] and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His."[4]

To draw the Spirit of God to us and to preserve Him in us, let us repent of our sins, for the Holy Spirit has said of Himself: "Wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body enslaved to sins."[5]

Let us humble ourselves profoundly under the hand of the Lord; for He has said, that He "gives grace to the humble."[6] "The Spirit of God," says St. Augustin,[7] "is received by humility, and repelled by pride. For it is water which seeks the lowly heart as a hollow place in which it may rest, but is thrown off by pride as by the steepness of the hill side."

Be chaste in body and in mind; for nothing is so opposed to the Holy Spirit, as an impure mind. "My Spirit shall not remain in man," said the Lord at the time of the deluge, "because he is flesh."[8] "Know ye not," St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "that your members are

[1] Gal. v. 22. [2] Matth. v. 3-10. [3] Rom. viii. 14.
[4] Rom. viii. 9. [5] Sap. i. 4. [6] 1 Pet. v. 5.
[7] Serm. 270, alias 22. [8] Gen. vi. 3.

the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you, whom you have from God?"[1] "If any man defile the temple of God; him shall God destroy."[2] "Glorify God whom you bear in your body."[3]

Pray, and continue perseveringly in prayer. "Our Father who is in heaven gives the good spirit to them that seek Him."[4] It was by their unanimous and persevering prayer that the Apostles drew down the Holy Spirit on the Cenacle.[5] At a later period it is said that "they prayed that the believers might receive the Holy Ghost."[6]

Let us keep our hearts in harmony and peace; the Spirit of charity cannot be allied with the spirit of dissension, hatred and vengeance.

Above all, let us hasten to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church. For that alone is the great dwelling which the Holy Spirit enlightens and inflames with His fire;—the only vessels whose sails are filled by this divine truth, the one and only spouse to whom Jesus Christ has promised and sent the Paraclete, the only assembly duly gathered together in His Name, and assisted by His Presence. Over her as over the humanity of the Saviour, the heavens are opened, and the celestial dove extends His wings; He alone is able to say at Trent as at Nice, "legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost;" He alone can define the faith in the terms consecrated by the Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem; "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[7]

"The Catholic Church," says St. Augustin after St. Paul, "is as it were a body of which the Holy Spirit is the soul. All the healthy members of that body, although they are employed in different duties, receive life from this soul. The soul gives vigor to all the members, sees by the eyes, hears by the ears, speaks by the tongue, works by the hands, walks by the feet, gives life to every mem-

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 19. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 17. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 20.
[4] Luc. xi. 13. [5] Act. i. 14. Act. viii. 15. [6] Act. xv. 28.

ber, and enables each to fulfil its own office, . . Their offices are different, their life common. So is it with the Church of God. Some of her members work miracles, others preach the truth, others preserve a virgin life, others conjugal chastity; each fulfils his proper functions, all have a common life. But, just as in the human body, if a member is cut off from the trunk, its life does not follow it. So, if the Catholic Christian is cut off from the body of Jesus Christ, that is from the Church, the Holy Spirit does not follow him. Would you then live by the Holy Spirit," he concludes, "preserve charity, love the truth, desire unity that you may attain to eternity."[1]

Meanwhile, however, the Spirit of God does not cease to act upon the hearts of heretics and unbelievers in order to lead them to the Church. In the Acts, we see Cornelius and several other Gentiles led as it were by the hand to Baptism and visibly endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Nay, in order to render them more docile, our kind Father frequently chastises His rebellious children. Let us not forget that it is written: "Such as I love, I rebuke and chastise. Be zealous therefore and do penance. Behold, I stand at the gate, and knock. If any man shall hear my voice, and open to me the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that shall overcome, I will give to sit with me on my throne: as I also have overcome and am set down with my Father on His throne. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches."[2]

III.

Ceremonies of Confirmation.

It remains for us to explain the ceremonies of Confirmation and the way with which the Holy Spirit has surrounded Himself in order to visit mankind.

[1] Serm. 267, *alias de tempore*, 186. [2] Apoc. iii. 19.

Over the head of the Saviour, at the moment of His baptism by St. John, the Holy Spirit showed Himself under the form of a dove. The dove is the emblem of simplicity, gentleness, grace and the chastest love. St. Thomas says a dove has no gall: "be ye simple as doves" were the words of our good Master. To let us understand that all these virtues are shed forth in the humanity of Christ, it was under this image, but without in any way uniting Himself to this passing form, that the Holy Spirit appeared to the multitude of the Jews.

Jesus Christ gives the Holy Spirit to His Apostles by breathing on them; to make them understand says St. Cyril,[2] that the Holy Spirit is as it were the breath of the Divine inspiration.

This same Spirit gives Himself to the Apostles under the form of tongues of fire, because He comes to make them *eloquent* and inflamed with zeal, says the Church.[3] It is especially by His love, or His Spirit, that "our God is a consuming fire."[4] The tongue, says St. Bernard, brings the inward words of man under the cognizance of the senses; so the Holy Spirit made the Word of God subject to sense by clothing Him with our nature in the Incarnation. The clearness and radiance of fire, says Bellarmine, symbolizes *knowledge;* the warmth of the flame, *zeal;* the form of tongues *eloquence*, all three gifts necessary for the apostolical ministry.

The signs which represent the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the faithful in Confirmation, are the imposition of hands, and anointing with the Holy Chrism.

The hand is the instrument and sign of strength, and in Scripture the power of God is called His Hand.[5] To lay hands on any one, then, in the name of God, is to call down upon him the strength of God.

[1] Joan. xx. 22. [2] Dial. vii.

[3] Verbis ut essent profiui. Et charitate fervidi. (*In festo Pentecostes, ad Laudes.*)

[4] Deus noster ignis consumens est. *Hebr.* xii. 29.

[5] Eduxit eos in manu forti, etc. *Deuter.* vii. 8.

What is called Chrism is a mixture of olive-oil and balsam, blessed and consecrated by the Bishop: hence it is called the Holy Chrism.

Oil, the quality of which is to diffuse and insinuate and attach itself, and to strengthen and facilitate the movements of the body which it moistens, is a perfect image of grace, which penetrates and pervades the soul, remains united to it, and renders the Lord's yoke so easy and His burden so light.

Balsam which diffuses a sweet odor and preserves from corruption, is the sign of the edification and the preservation from sin, which are the excellent fruits of the presence of the Holy Spirit in us.

The anointing is made on the forehead, the seat of shame and fear, from which it can diffuse itself over the whole body, to teach us that grace ought to fill the whole soul, and strengthen us especially against pusillanimity and false shame. It is made in the form of a cross because grace comes from the cross; because from it all blessings flow, and it is of the cross above all that the forehead ought never to be ashamed.

Before describing the ceremonies which accompany the *imposition of hands* and the anointing, let us say a few words of the consecration of the oil destined to serve as the matter in confirmation. This consecration is performed on Holy Thursday, in the course of the holy mysteries, and is done with the greatest solemnity. The following is the beautiful preface which is the prelude to this ceremony. The Bishop chants:

. . . . . "We should at all times and in all places give thanks to Thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Everlasting God: who, at the beginning, among the other gifts of thy bounty didst command the earth to bring forth trees bearing fruit, and among them the olive that ministers this rich liquid, whose fruits was to serve for the Sacred Chrism, as David foreknowing by the Prophetic Spirit, the Sacraments of Thy grace, said in the

Psalms, that our countenances should be made cheerful by oil; and when of old time the sins of the world were done away by the outpouring of the deluge, the dove announced by an olive-branch that peace was restored to earth, exhibiting a similitude of thy future gift; as has been shown by manifest effects in these last days; in that when the waters of Baptism wash away all our past sins, this anointing makes our countenances cheerful and serene. For this cause also thou didst command Thy servant Moses, that after his brother Aaron had been washed in water he should consecrate him Priest by pouring this oil upon him. A yet greater honor was added, when Thy Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, required John to wash Him in the waters of Jordan, to the end that after the Holy Spirit had come down from Heaven in the form of a Dove, Thou mightest manifest Thy only begotten Son in whom Thou art well pleased, by the testimony of the Voice that followed; and prove most clearly that this is what the Prophet has sung; that He was to be anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows. We beseech Thee, therefore, Holy Lord, Almighty Father, through the same Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord, to vouchsafe to sanctify with thy blessing the richness of this Thy creature and to mingle with it the virtue of Thy Holy Spirit, with the cooperation of the power of Thy Son Christ, from whose Holy Name, its name of Chrism was received, wherewith Thou didst anoint Priests, Kings, Prophets, and Martyrs; that Thou mayst make this Thy creature of Chrism a sacrament of perfect salvation and life for those who are to be renewed by the Baptism of the spiritual bath: that the sanctification of the anointing being infused into them, the corruption of their first birth may be done away, and each one as a holy temple may diffuse the odor of an acceptable innocent life: that being anointed, according to the Sacrament of Thy ordinance, with the dignity of Kings, Priests, and Prophets, they may be

clothed with the garment of Thy incorruptible gift. That it may be the anointing salvation to those who have been born again of water and the Holy Ghost, and may make them partakers of everlasting life and sharers of heavenly glory?"

The Bishop in mixing the balsam and the oil had said: "Let us pray to our Almighty Lord God, who by a wonderful dispensation hath joined together inseparably the incomprehensible God-head of His only begotten and co-eternal Son with true humanity, and by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, hath anointed Him with the oil of gladness above His fellows, that man, consisting of a two-fold and yet single substance, having been ruined by the fraud of the devil, might be restored to the everlasting inheritance from which he had fallen;—let us beseech Him that He would bless by the perfecting of the blessed Trinity the two liquids formed from different species of His creatures, and by blessing would sanctify them; that they may be blended together and become one, that whosoever is outwardly anointed with them, may be so anointed inwardly, that being freed from all infirmities of His corporeal nature, he may rejoice in being made partaker of thy heavenly kingdom, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

Let us now see in what manner the anointing itself is performed. Every Christian arrived at that critical age when the obligation of virtue, that is to say, of manly strength, begins, since the passions will soon be felt in their violence and force,—all the young, who cannot continue Christians without fighting in their ranks in the Church militant, are carefully prepared by special instructions. They have been reminded of the obligations of the Christian life; they have ratified the sacred engagements of their Baptism, they have gained a more perfect knowledge of the Holy Spirit and the gifts which He dispenses. On the appointed day, they present themselves in the

temple of God, ranged in front in two lines like soldiers, they come, in fact to be armed Knights of Christ. Meanwhile the Bishop, after having by means of some questions and a sort of examination, assured himself of their being sufficiently instructed, prostrates Himself, and invokes the Spirit of God by a solemn chant, while all candidates kneel.

Come, O Creator Spirit blest!
And in our souls take up Thy rest!
Come, with Thy grace and heavenly aid,
To fill the hearts which Thou hast made

Great Paraclete! to Thee we cry;
O highest gift of God most high!
O fount of life! O fire of love!
And sweet anointing from above!

Thou in Thy sevenfold gifts art known;
The Finger of God's Hand we own;
The promise of the Father Thou!
Who dost the tongue with power endow.

Kindle our senses from above,
And make our hearts o'erflow with love;
With patience firm, and virtue high,
The weakness of our flesh supply.

Far from us drive the foe we dread,
And grant us Thy true peace instead;
So shall we not, with Thee for guide,
Turn from the path of life aside.

Oh, may Thy grace on us bestow,
The Father and the Son to know,
And Thee through endless times confessed,
Of both the eternal Spirit blest.

All glory while the ages run,
Be to the Father, and the Son
Who rose from death; the same to Thee,
O Holy Ghost, eternally. Amen.[1]

After this invocation, the Bishop rises; he extends His hands over the candidates, and at the same time, entreats the Lord to send down upon them, from on high, "The Spirit of wisdom and strength, the Spirit of counsel and understanding, the Spirit of piety, knowledge, and the fear of God" and to vouchsafe, of His goodness, to sign them with the sign of the Cross unto life eternal. The clergy and people unite in these prayers, by saying aloud after each of them, "Amen;" "So be it."

Then the Bishop approaches the young persons separately; he anoints the forehead of each with the holy Chrism, in the form of a cross, saying: "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross. I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Fortified by this divine anointing, the Christian has become a soldier of Christ; the Bishop would seem to wish at once to put his constancy to the trial. He does for him, a knight of the Church militant, what he is accustomed to do when he blesses a warrior armed for bodily contests. After having placed in the hands of the knight the sword of battle, the bishop strikes him three times on the shoulder and once on the cheek, as though for the purpose of testing the calmness and patience of his courage; at the same time saying: "Be thou a peaceful and brave warrior, faithful and devoted to God."—In the same way, after marking the forehead of the confirmed Christian with the sign of the Cross, the Bishop gently puts his hand on his cheek, saying: "Peace be with thee." And at last blesses him in these words: "The Lord

[1] This translation of the "Veni Creator Spiritus" is from the "Missal for the Laity."

bless you out of Sion, that you may see the prosperity of Jerusalem all the days of your life, and attain to life everlasting. Amen."

IV.

Errors of Protestants; and Canons of the Church which condemn them.

Such are the ceremonies of Confirmation. Wicliff maintained that it was not a Sacrament, on the ground that the Holy Spirit having been given by Baptism, the bishops could not give it a second time. For some time Luther reckoned it among the sacraments; as appears from these words in one of his discourses: "The Eucharist is no more a sacrifice than the other sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, &c." But at a later period he said: "Avoid the mockery of Confirmation, a veritable imposture. I allow them to confirm, provided it is understood that God has said nothing about it; what the Bishops say of it is a heap of lies: they mock God by calling it a Sacrament, when in fact it is nothing but a human invention, &c."[1]

Melancthon expresses himself with less violence in the *Apologia*. He admits that Confirmation is a rite adopted by the Fathers, but denies that it is of Divine institution.

At a later period the Lutherans attempted to replace Catholic Confirmation by a ceremony which they decked out with the same name and of which Kemnitz regulated the arrangements. Children, baptized in infancy, are to be instructed in the elements of the faith, and then presented to the bishop, who in presence of the congregation reminds them of the engagements which they contracted in Baptism. They repeat in his presence a confession of faith which they have learned by heart. The bishop questions them, exhorts them to perseverance, offers a

[1] *De Captiv. Babyl. De Confirm.*

public prayer for their Confirmation in the faith, and afterwards, if he thinks it desirable, lays his hands on them. Calvin approves a ceremony of this kind.[1]

Zuinglius maintained that Confirmation was nothing more than a solemn examination, to which those who had been baptized in infancy, were subjected by the Church.

As to Calvin, he went beyond all bounds; he defined Confirmation: "An oil polluted by the lies of the devil, who deceives the hearts of the simple, and envelopes them in darkness."[2] According to him, the bishops who confirm are "mountebanks, apes, harlequins, impostors."[3] "There is not one ancient author," he says, "nay, not an author even of the middle age, already so corrupt, who mentions this oil.[4] They who call it the oil of salvation renounce the salvation . . . which is in Christ. This grease hatches and nourishes a thousand monstrosities." He calls the fathers of Trent "horned and mitred asses, no more capable of fulfilling the duties of bishops, than a pig is of singing."[5]—"They are Donatists," he says, "who make the virtue of the sacrament depend on the dignity of the minister." In another place he apostrophizes in the following terms the holy Pope and Martyr Melchiades, who had said, 'Baptism regenerates us to life, Confirmation arms us for the combat:' "Sacrilegious mouth, darest thou compare this grease, defiled with the stench of thy breath, and bewitched by the incantations thou didst mutter over it, with the Sacrament of Jesus Christ, and water sanctified by the word of God."[6] Lastly, he carries the spirit of moderation, sobriety, and

[1] Inst. l. iv. c. 19, n. 13.

[2] Inst. l. iv. c. 19, n. 8.

[3] Inst. l. iv. c. 19, n. 6, 7, 11.

[4] *Antid. Conc.* Sess. vii, *De Confirm.* can. II.

[5] Cornuti et infulati asini, ad obeundum munus episcopale nihilo aptiores quam ad canendum porci. *Antid.* Sess. vii. *De Confirm.* can. iii.

[6] Os sacrilegum, tune pinguedinem fætore duntaxat anhelitus tui inquinatum et verborum murmure incantatam audes Christi sacramento opponere, et conferre cum aqua verbo Dei sanctificata? *Inst.* l. iv. c. 49, n. 10.

urbanity so far as to say: "For all this oil which you use either at Baptism or at Confirmation, I would not give . . . ne unum quidem stercus."[1]

Qui dixerit verbum contra spiritum sanctum, non remittetur ei, neque in hoc sæculo neque in futuor.[2]

These errors were anathematized in the following canons:

Canons on Confirmation.

Continuation of the Seventh Session.

Canon I. If any one saith,[3] that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism, whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church; let him be anathema.

Canon II. If any one saith, that they who ascribe any virtue[4] to the sacred chrism of confirmation, offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost; let him be anathema.

Canon III. If any one saith, that the ordinary minister of Holy Confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest[5] soever; let him be anathema.

[1] Vestrum oleum non unius stercoris facimus, sive in Baptismo, sive in Confirmatione. *Inst.* n. 11.

[2] Matth. xii. 32.

[3] C. *Nullus ministrorum.* Cons. dist. IV.

[4] See the end of the letter of Urban I. *Ad omnes*, etc. C. 1. cum seq. *De Cons.* dist. V.

[5] C. *Manus*, de Cons. dist. V. Council of Florence in the decree of Eugenius IV. See the letter of Pope Eusebius I. to the Bishops of Tuscany, Innocent I. Epis. I. c. 3, and hereafter Sess. XXIII. C. 4.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

Of the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

Thirteenth, Twenty-first and Twenty-second Sessions.

1.

Of Sacrifice in General.

In the true religion there must necessarily be a divinely appointed mode of participating in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the one only source of salvation for the children of Adam.

What is that mode? We may form some anticipation of it from the history of the world before the time of Christ's advent.

Everywhere, from the very beginning, we find two mysterious institutions, inseparable from each other: sacrifice and priesthood. One name (in Latin) is derived from the other: *Sacerdos a sacrificando*, as Cicero says, *quod illorum est proprium et maximum munus. Pontifex id est potens facere*,[1] say the etymologists. "Every priest," says St. Paul, "is ordained and appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices."[2] The consecrating bishop says to the deacon, whom he ordains, "It is necessary that the priest offer sacrifices."[3] "Under all the laws which have governed mankind," remarks the Council of Trent, "priesthood and sacrifice have been indissolubly united."

Sacrifice, of which the comprehension is as old as the world, is the oblation of an immolated victim, made to

[1] Diction. de *Moreri.*

[2] Omnis pontifex constituitur. . . ut offerat. . . sacrificia pro peccatis. *Hebr.* v, 1. and viii, 3.

[3] Sacerdotem oportet offerre.

God in acknowledgement of His sovereignty, and to appease His justice: an offering and immolation, of which repentant man appropriates the benefit by identifying himself, through communion, with the victim offered.

In order to be worthy of acceptance by God in place of the guilty man, the *victim* is everywhere a chosen specimen, as precious to God and man, as near to the one and the other, as possible. The object of the *immolation* is to remind the sinner, that his offence merits death, and that his gifts are nothing to God. This immolation is so necessary that without it, "without the shedding of blood," according to St. Paul's axiom, "there is no remission."[1] As to *communion*, it is to prove that the victim immolated dies in our stead and for our benefit. "By eating the victims offered on the altar, the Israelites participated in the sacrifice," says St. Paul.[2] Rollin has said of the pagans: "Among them the feast followed the sacrifice and made a part of it." One of our good writers has very truly observed: "A communion with grace, at once spiritual and material, invisible in its essence and visible in its manifestation, such was the centre towards which tended the liturgies of all nations in that which they had in common; such was the living focus of universal worship."[3]

Legitimate worship offers to God sacrifices definitely appointed by His law. The forms of worship reprobated by our Lord, offer victims to false deities, or immolate to the true God sacrifices which He repudiates, for instance, human victims.

During fifteen centuries the principal sacrifice prescribed by the Mosaic law was this:

Every year, on the tenth day of the first month, every head of a family was to procure a male lamb, of that year, free from all blemish and defect. Four days later, at the

[1] Sine sanguinis effusione non fit remissio. *Hebr.* ix. 22.
[2] Qui edunt hostias participes sunt altaris. 1 Cor. x. 18.
[3] Gerbet, *Dogme générateur*, p. 44.

same hour in every house, the lamb was sacrificed, care being taken not to break any of its bones. As to the *communion*, it was to be made in haste (*festinanter*,) with a sort of hurried eagerness (*vorabitis*,) in the posture and dress of travellers ready to set out (*renes accingetis.*) *You will have shoes on your feet—staves in your hands.* No part of the victim was to remain until the morning, neither the head, nor the feet, nor the entrails; and with the flesh roasted with fire, they could eat none but unleavened bread, no other vegetables than wild or bitter lettuce. The blood of the lamb sprinkled on the transom and door jambs of each house, so as to form a T or a cross, had in Egypt averted the death, which the destroying angel brought into the dwellings of God's enemies.[1]

Accordingly, it was under pain of death and extermination that this sacrifice and communion were required.[2]

And yet the Lord, at the same time, that He prescribed these bloody immolations under penalties so severe, declared incessantly by His prophets, that in His eyes all these victims were valueless, insufficient, unworthy, that they provoked His disgust and His aversion. He announced by Daniel, that after some years "the sacrifices offered in the temple are to cease:" by Malachy, that "soon in every place a pure oblation shall be offered in His name:" by David, that "Christ shall be a Priest according to the order of Melchisedech; that is to say, that in His sacrifice He will follow the rite adopted by that mysterious personage, who represented the victim promised to the world under the symbols of bread and wine: . . . etc.

How are we to reconcile these apparent contradictions? Nothing is more easy for one who knows "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Such is the victim that all other victims prefigured, in view of whom they were prescribed, chosen, accepted. His immolation

[1] Exod. xii.

[2] Exterminabitur anima illius de populis suis. *Num.* ix. 13.

on the cross, made present at all times and in all places on our altars,—such is the sacrifice which every holocaust every hecatomb was to represent, else it would be of no value in the eyes of the Most High. The Eucharistic communion, which, under the forms of bread and wine, makes us participate in His Flesh and Blood, and thereby in the merits of His death, is that which all participation in sacrifice by the eating of the victim, and especially Abraham's participation in the offering of Melchisedech, prefigured and promised to the world.

Isaac, climbing the hill of Moriah, bending under the weight of the wood which was to consume the victim in his sacrifice, asked his father, who was walking beside him with the fire and a sword, "But where is the victim for the holocaust?"[1] Such was the enquiry which had been made of the Lord by all the patriarchs, by all the just, by all those who, before and after Moses, had covered the altars with blood, whether they were within or without the chosen race. The sacrificer, the victim, the officers, the witnesses of the sacrifice, all, ever since the time of Abel, renewed unceasingly that great question: *Ubi est victima holocausti?*

II.

Of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The promise and institution of it according to Scripture.

And, from the very beginning the Lord answered all who were willing to hear Him, as Abraham answered Isaac: "God will provide Himself a victim for a holocaust, my son." *Deus providebit sibi victimam holocausti, fili mi!*

And in fact, as soon as the Incarnate Word entered into the world, He said to His Father: "Sacrifice and oblation Thou wouldest not; but a body hast Thou fitted to me:

Holocausts for sin did not please Thee: then said I, Behold I come."[2]

[1] Genes. xxii, 7. [2] Hebr. x. 5.

It is the Lamb of God, then, who comes in person to take the place of the victims, with which the priest heaped the altars in vain; and soon it will be granted to us, to take a part, as sweet as it will be precious, in His sacrifice. This is what He promises us Himself in terms the most explicit.

Jesus has just fed five thousand men in the desert with five loaves and two fishes. Profiting by the admiration which this miracle excited to elicit faith in still greater prodigies, He says:

"I am the bread of life.

"Your fathers did eat manna in the desert and are dead.

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it, he may not die.

"I am the living bread, which came down from heaven.

"If any man eat of this bread he shall life forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.

"The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

"Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say unto you; except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you.

"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.

"For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;

"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him.

"As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.

"This is the bread that came down from heaven: Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever."[1]

Such is the promise made us by the Lamb of God. It

[1] Joan. vi. 48. etc.

is expressed in terms so definite, that we conceive it superfluous to add any commentary: to discuss a text so clear would seem to imply a distrust in the penetration or the good faith of our readers. "You are not to ask why we adhere to the proper and literal sense, any more than you would ask a traveller why he followed the high road. It is for those who have recourse to figurative interpretations and to by-paths to give a reason for what they do."[1] At the same time an obstinate contradiction, which has lasted for three centuries, enables us to understand well the meaning and the truth of this declaration which the Son of God addressed to the people of Capharnaum: "It is the Spirit (that is, grace) which giveth life: the flesh (that is, nature) profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and life." They are intelligible to men aided by grace, but to them only.[2] This is what the Saviour explains and confirms in the words which immediately follow: "No man can come unto me, unless it be given him by my Father."

Let us now see the accomplishment of these magnificent promises. The following, according to the combined narrations of the Evangelists, is the manner, in which our Saviour proceeds to the institution of the Eucharist:

"The evening before His death, immediately after the celebration of the Paschal sacrifice, Jesus took bread,[3]

[1] *Exposition*, de Bossuet, n. 10.

[2] Joan. vi. 66. Such is invariably the meaning presented by the opposition of *spirit* and *flesh* which recurs so frequently in the Gospels and in the writings of the Apostles. See especially the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (v. 9, 13): "Vos autem in carne non estis, sed in spiritu. . . . si secundum carnem vixeritis, moriemini; si spiritu facta carnis mortificaveritis, vivetis. . . ." and "Cum essemus in carne, nunc autem soluti sumus ut serviamus in novitate spiritus." (See Galat. v. 16.) "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit," said our Lord in St. John, (iii. 6.) "You began in the spirit," said St. Paul to the Galatians (iii. 3.) "and you would now be made perfect by the flesh." This sense is now admitted by the greater number of Protestant expositors and philologists.

[3] Matth. xxvi. 26.

gave thanks,[1] blessed, brake, and gave to His disciples, saying: Take ye and eat. This is my body,[2] which is given for you; Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner He took the chalice[3] also, after He had supped, gave thanks, and gave it to His Apostles; saying: Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood, the blood of the new covenant,[4] which shall be shed for you,[5] and for many for the remission of sins.[6] And they all drank of it."[7]

The Apostle St. Paul gives the account of this same institution to the faithful at Corinth in the following terms:[8] "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night He was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke and said: Take ye and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice after He had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."

In another place, wishing to turn away the Corinthians from all participation in idolatrous sacrifices, the Apostle wrote to them: "I speak as to wise men: judge ye yourselves what I say: The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break is it not the partaking of

[1] Luc. xxii. 19. [2] Matth. xxvi. 28 [3] Luc. xxii. 19, 20.
[4] Matth. xxvi. 28. [5] Luc. xxii. 20. [6] Matth. xxvi. 28.
[7] Marc. xiv. 23. [8] 1 Cor. xi. 23.

the body of the Lord? For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread. Behold Israel according to the flesh, are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? The thing which the heathen sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God. And I would not that ye should be partakers with devils. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils."[1]

According to these words of the Apostle, then, the Christian worship has its sacrifice, as the Jews and heathens had theirs. In all forms of religion a person participates in the sacrifice by taking part of the victim immolated: and we Christians, in participating in the Eucharistic chalice and bread, receive the body and blood of Christ, and being all nourished with this same food become one and the same body with Him.

The same Apostle, in his epistle to the Hebrews, setting out from the principle, that a better food ought to produce a better life, thus exhorts Christians to surpass in virtue the children of Israel: "We have an altar," that on which a victim is sacrificed θυμιαστήριον "whereof they have on power to eat, who serve the tabernacle." This victim is propitiatory, the Apostle proceeds to say: "The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary, by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people by His own blood, suffered without the gate (of Jerusalem). Let us go forth therefore to Him, without the camp; (i.e. the synagogue) bearing His reproach, . . . &c."[2]

In the Acts of the Apostles there are several passages which evidently refer to the reception of the Sacrament, and to the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is said of the prophets and doctors of Antioch, that as they were *celebrating* (λειτουργούντων) and fasting, the Holy Spirit spoke to them;[3] and of the first Christians, that they per-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 15. [2] Ad Heb. xiii. 10. [3] Acts. xiii. 2.

severed in the doctrines of the Apostles, the communion of the breaking of bread, (or the Eucharist,[1]) and prayer.

All these texts, and many others which we omit, plainly show: 1. That Jesus Christ has been pleased to give to each one of us, by His testament, that which he assumed and offered on the cross for us all, making His humanity, which He sacrificed for our salvation, the medicine, the food, the vivifying principle of our humanity. 2. That with this object, the night before He suffered He instituted a sacrifice according to the rite of Melchisedech, in which our senses perceive only the bread and wine offered, but where faith discovers His body and His blood really present reduced to the condition of food and drink 3. That this presence of the body of Jesus Christ is such, that He could say in all verity, speaking of what He had in His hands and in the chalice: "This is my body; This is my blood." 4. That the Apostles and disciples, according to the power and obligation they had received, celebrated the same sacrifice. 5. That the first christians were eager to participate in it by means of the communion, being careful first of all to examine themselves, lest they should make themselves guilty of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, if they ate that bread and drank that chalice unworthily, not discerning there the body of the Lord.

III.

The Testimony of Tradition.

Are these not legitimate conclusions? We can ask the answer from tradition.

If the Catholic Church has rightly understood the words by which her heavenly Bridegroom unites Himself to her forever, the Fathers will have expressly taught the Real Presence, transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the

[1] Acts. ii. 42. "Erant perseverantes in communicatione fractionis panis." According to the Syriac version; Communicabant in precibus et fractione Eucharistiæ."

Altar: the most ancient liturgies will have expressed their belief in the same sense; the pagans will not have failed to caricature this belief and to seek in it a pretext for their calumnious accusations: the Christians on their part, lest they should cast their pearls before swine, will have surrounded these awful mysteries with a religious secrecy; the first heresies will have preserved some fragments of this belief, &c.

Now all these facts are manifestly seen. History attests it. From the Fathers we will merely cite a few passages.

St. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, instructed his neophytes in these terms:[1] "This teaching of the blessed Paul," (1 Cor. xi, 23. &c. which had been read as a sort of text) "is of itself sufficient to give you full assurance with regard to the Holy Mysteries, in which when you are thought worthy to be admitted, you will become of one body and one blood with Christ. For you have just heard the Apostle proclaiming that our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread and giving thanks, broke and gave it to His disciples, saying; Take, eat, this is my body: and having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, Take, drink, this is my blood. When He Himself then has declared it, and said of the bread, *This is my body*, who shall henceforward presume to doubt? and when He has positively affirmed and said, *This is my blood*, who shall be in uncertainty, saying: it is not His blood? He once changed water into wine, which is not unlike blood, at Cana of Galilee; and does He not deserve to be trusted when He turns wine into blood? He wrought that strange and extraordinary miracle, when He was invited to an earthly marriage; shall we not much rather acknowledge with thankfulness, that He has granted to the children of His bridechamber the enjoyment of His body and blood! Let us therefore partake of them with the fullest assurance as the body and blood of Christ; for under the form of bread

[1] *Catech.* iv.

is His body given thee, and under the form of wine His blood is given thee: that by partaking of the body and blood of Christ thou mayest be of one body and one blood with Him. For thus we come to bear Christ in us, to be *Christophori*, His body and His blood being diffused through our members: and thus, according to the blessed Peter, we are *made partakers of the divine nature* . . . Do not then look on the bread and wine as mere (bread and wine): for, according to the Lord's own assertion, they are the Body and Blood of Christ. For even if thy senses suggest a doubt to thee, let thy faith confirm and strengthen thee. Judge not of the reality of the matter by taste, but let faith fully and without any doubt assure thee that thou hast been thought worthy to partake of the body and blood of Christ."

A few years later, St. Ambrose, the great bishop of Milan, whose disciple St. Augustine was, wrote:[1] That bread is indeed bread before the sacramental words are uttered: but when consecration is added, from being bread it becomes the body of Christ. Let us establish this point then. How can that which is bread be the body of Christ? By consecration. And by what words is consecration effected, and by whose words? By those of the Lord Jesus. For all that is said in the liturgy before the consecration is said by the priest; praises are offered to God; prayers are asked for the people, the princes and the rest; but at the moment the adorable Sacrament is to be produced, the priest ceases to speak in his own name; he uses the words of Christ. It is the word of Christ, therefore, which makes this sacrament. What is the word of Christ? It is that word by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the heavens were made; the Lord commanded and the earth was made: the Lord commanded and the seas were made: The Lord commanded, and every created being was produced. You see then how powerful and effective is the

[1] *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv. c. 4.

word of Christ. And if the word of the Lord Jesus had such power, that things which had no existence began to exist, how much more efficacious shall it be in causing what already exists to be changed into another? There was no heaven, there was no sea, there was no earth: but listen to David: "He spake and they were made: He commanded and they were created." To reply then to your objection, before consecration it was not the body of Christ—but after consecration I say to you, that now it is the body of Christ. "*He spake and it was made.*" But to return. It was indeed a great marvel and worthy of veneration, that manna was rained from heaven for the Jews: but consider; which is greater, manna or the body of Christ? Surely the body of Christ, who is the maker of heaven. Besides, he that ate the manna died; whereas he that eateth this body will obtain remission of sins, and will not die eternally. It is not then without reason, that thou sayest *Amen*, already confessing in spirit that thou art receiving the body of Christ. The priest says to thee, "*the Body of Christ*," and thou sayest, "*Amen*," that is, *it is true*. Let thy heart and feelings hold fast what thy tongue confesseth."

St. Augustine is not less explicit than his master. In his explanation of the thirty-third psalm, he writes thus: "How this is to be understood literally of David himself I do not see; but I do see how it is to be understood of Christ. For Christ was borne in His own hands when, speaking of His own very body, He said, This is My Body. For that body is borne in His own hands."[1]

Let us conclude with some passages from the Golden Mouth. St. John Chrysostom addressed the following words to his people at Antioch: "Since, therefore, that Word says, '*This is my Body*,' let us take Him at His word, and believe, and see Him with the eye of the mind. For Christ has not imparted to us anything belonging to the world of sense, but, though given through sensible

[1] *Enarratio in Ps.* xxxiii. n. 10.

objects all His gifts are spiritual. So in Baptism, the gift is bestowed by means of water, an object of sense, but what is really effected is spiritual, . . our birth, nay, our new birth, or renewal. Hadst thou indeed been incorporeal, He would have given thee His incorporeal gifts in their nakedness; but inasmuch as thy soul is united to a body, He gives thee what is spiritual in what is sensible. How many are they that say: How I should have wished to see His fair form, His figure, His clothes, His shoes! Why here you see Him, you touch Him, you eat im; and while you are longing to see His clothes, He gives you Himself, not to look at only, but to touch, and to eat, and to receive within you. Let no one then come to Him with levity and carelessness; but all inflamed (with love,) fervent and earnest. For if the Jews ate their Passover standing, with shoes on their feet and staves in their hands, and with all earnestness; much more oughtest thou to be prudent and wakeful. For they were going out of Egypt into Palestine, and so they were in the guise of travellers, whereas thou art going to leave this world for heaven. Wherefore we ought to be on all hands watchful: for the punishment appointed for those who receive unworthily is no light one. Think how indignant thou art against the traitor, and against those that crucified Him: beware then lest thou be guilty of the body and blood of Christ. They mangled that all-sacred body; and thou receivest it into a polluted soul, and that, too, after so many mercies. For it was not enough for Him to become man, nor yet to be buffeted and slain; He ever mingles Himself with us, and makes us His body, not only by faith, but in very truth and reality. What purity then can be too great for him who partakes of this sacrifice? Purer than the very sunbeam should the hand be that divides this flesh, the mouth that is filled with spiritual fire, the tongue that is purpled with that most awe-inspiring blood! Think what an honor has been done thee: of what a table thou art a partaker! That

which the angels behold with trembling, and dare not gaze on without fear because of the radiance that beams from it, with that are we fed, with that we are commingled, and we ourselves become Christ's one body and one blood! Who shall speak of the mighty works of the Lord, and make all His praises heard? What shepherd feeds his sheep with his own limbs? and why say I, shepherd? Mothers there often are, who, after all their travail pains, hire out their children to be nursed by others: but He endured not to do this, but feeds us Himself with His own blood, and by every means unites us to Himself."[1]

I will add, from Perrone, an exact and summary statement of the teaching of the Fathers.

Several of them say in express terms that the Eucharist is not the figure of the body of Jesus Christ, but that body itself. (St. Ambrose, St. Epiphanius, Euthymius, St. John Damascene, Theophylact.) The Eucharist, however, is a *sacrament*, and may, consequently, be called *a sign*, *a figure*, but the sign, the figure of a reality invisibly present.—Other Fathers teach that Jesus Christ unites Himself to us in this mystery, not merely by faith, but corporally. (St. John Chrysostum, St. Hilary, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Alexandria). Several of them extol the love of the Saviour who feeds us with His own flesh, which no shepherd ever did for his sheep, or mother for her children. (St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine.) St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Cyril, St. John Damascene explain why Jesus Christ gives Himself to us under the forms of bread and wine, and not under His real form.—St. Justin, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, and others, call the Eucharist a great miracle, and the work of divine omnipotence. Some compare the change, which is wrought at the altar, to the change of water into wine, which took place at the marriage of Cana.—Others recommend the faithful not to consult their senses, but the word of Jesus Christ, in judging of

[1] Hom. in St. Matth. lxxxii. n. 4, 5.

His sacramental presence.—Most of them call this mystery, adorable, awful, fearful, and this bread the living, life-giving, holy, incorruptible bread which makes God Himself our food.—All speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, an oblation, but a better sacrifice than those of Melchisedech and the paschal lamb, . . an *oblation*, in which there are on the one hand *priests*, on the other a *sacrifice*, a *victim;* the same victim that was laid in the manger at His birth, stretched on the cross at His death. —St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Gaudentius, remind us that this doctrine ought to be guarded by the law of secrecy (*disciplina arcani*).[1] It is certain, says the Protestant, Grabe,[2] that Irenæus and all the Fathers who lived with the Apostles or a little after them, "recognize in the Eucharist the sacrifice of the new covenant. This was not a belief peculiar to this or that church, to this or that Father. On the contrary it was the public faith and teaching of the Church, which held fast the deposit of the Apostles, as the Apostles had received it from Jesus Christ Himself. Irenæus proves this clearly in the thirty-second and thirty-fourth chapters (of his fourth book) Against Heresies. Before him Justin had maintained the same doctrine in his first Apology addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, and still more explicitly in his Dialogue with Tryphon. It is useless to cite these texts, or those of St. Ignatius, Tertullian and Cyprian. They have often been transcribed by Roman Catholic authors and by learned Protestants."

Accordingly, sects that have been separated from the Church ever since the first centuries; the Nestorians, the Eutychians, Armenians, Jacobites, and even before Nestorius, the Marcosians, the Gnostics, &c., have preserved

[1] On this subject see Schelstadts work, *de Disciplina Arcani*, Palma, vol. 1. This rule of secrecy supplies a ready and decisive answer to the objections derived from some obscure or enigmatical passages of the Fathers.

[2] Grabe, cited by Esslinger, *Entretiens d'un ministre Protestant converti avec un de ses anciens coreligionnaires, p.* 278.

the Catholic belief and rites of the Eucharist. And in these later times, the leader of the Sacramentarians, Zuinglius, was obliged to admit, that the belief in the corporeal presence of the Saviour prevailed in the time of Augustine;[1] Calvin, that the early Church had adored the Eucharist;[2] and Luther, writing in 1532 to Albert, duke of Prussia, said: "This article has been believed and acknowledged by common consent, from the beginning of the Christian Church to our days. This is proved by the writings of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin. The testimony given by the holy Church ought alone to be sufficient to make us accept the obvious meaning of the words of Jesus Christ, and reject the wild interpretations of the sectaries; for it is dangerous, it is fearful to listen to and to believe a voice which contradicts the unanimous testimony and belief of Christendom, and the doctrine uniformly held during fifteen centuries. To raise doubts on this subject would be to condemn as heretics, the Church and Christ Himself with His Apostles and Prophets. . . . Besides," he goes on, "the divisions which break out among the sectaries, who separate into as many sects as there are different interpretations of the same text, are a strong enough proof of their unreasonableness. They cannot teach anything positive, nor enlighten a conscience tormented by doubts." These admissions of the principal leaders make it unnecessary for us to quote the statements of their disciples who have spoken in the same sense; as Hospinian, Grotius, Clarke, Wegscheider, etc.

We will conclude by citing some of the most ancient liturgies: they all attest belief in the Real Presence, in the Eucharistic sacrifice, in transubstantiation, or the change of the substances of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

[1] Lib. *de Ver. et fals. relig.*

[2] Qui sic faciunt habent Ecclesiæ veteris exemplum; fateor. *Inst.* l. iv. c. 17 and 19.

The Greek liturgy of Alexandria thus prays the Lord: "That Thy grace may change (or transfer) these offerings into the body and blood of our Saviour."

The Gothic Missal, called also the old Gallican, says in the Mass of the Epiphany: "May He who this day changed water into wine, now change (convert) the wine here offered into His own blood." The Roman liturgy has consecrated these expressions: "Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all respects to bless, approve, ratify and accept: that it may be made for us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."

At the moment of distributing the Eucharist, the celebrant, in exhibiting the Host to the people, said to them "*Corpus Christi!*" the faithful responded "*Amen!*" We have heard St. Ambrose comment on these words:

"The agreement of the liturgies of all ages and places proves that this kind of prayer is of Apostolic institution." Thus the Protestant Grotius expresses himself.[1]

IV.

Consequences of Transubstantiation in relation to Communion under one kind only.

It is important in this place to remark that there are three consequences of the dogma of transubstantiation, which are admitted, like the doctrine itself, by the teaching and universal practice of the Church.

The first is, that the gifts which represent our material food, the bread and wine, are changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ *living*, and consequently to the body not separate from the blood, to the blood, not separate from the body, to the body and blood not separate from the soul and divinity of Christ.

After consecration, then, there is not here the body and there the blood; but under the sacramental sign,

[1] Votum pro pace.

however reduced be its dimensions and whatever be its form, there exists the humanity of the Saviour, entire, indivisible, immortal, such as It is in heaven, only veiling Its glory from our senses. Accordingly, a drop which falls from the Chalice, a crumb which is separated from the consecrated Host, are, the one as well as the other, the thrice holy humanity which was sacrificed for us on the cross. Make the bread of the largest dimensions—the body of Jesus Christ will not on that account be greater. Add to the consecrated Host the distribution of the Cup—it will be for the communicant just simply as if the Host was larger. It is with the Eucharist as with Baptism. Torrents of water poured on the catechumen represent, perhaps, better the purifying grace of regeneration, but they do not confer it more abundantly. In the sacrament of the dying, one single annointing is not less salutary than the five which are ordinarily made. In a word, let the sacramental sign be more or less extended, more or lees expressive, it matters little: the grace signified is not on that account produced less entire.

To illustrate the subject by comparison: Moses, by God's command, was to strike the rock and make a fountain of living water spring forth from the stone. Now, suppose that to this appointed sign he adds some words, with emphasis of voice and bodily gestures; suppose he strikes the rock twice or thrice, with greater or less force, what does it matter? These multiplied signs will perhaps betray a feeling of distrust or incredulity, they will not draw a more abundant supply of water from the rock. The signs may make men attentive to the operation of God, they effect nothing of themselves. The Creator said without emphasis, "Be light made!" and light was made; when He speaks by the instrumentality of a creature, this creature ought to imitate His style. It would be puerile then to measure the efficacy of the Baptism of Jesus Christ by the quantity of water poured out, and

the grace of the Priesthood or of Confirmation by the quantity of oil used.

As to the Eucharist, it is in the first place a sacrifice, and then a sacrament. In the action of the sacrifice, the bloody immolation of the Saviour has to be represented, and in the sacrament the feeding of the Christian. The sign of the bloody immolation, according to the institution of Jesus Christ, is the action, which, saying separately over the bread, "This is my body," and over the wine, "This is my blood," recalls, and, if there were no obstacle, would also operate by these words, *vi verborum*, the violent separation of the blood from the body which consummated on the cross the sacrifice of the Saviour. The employment of the two species (of bread and wine) is therefore necessary at the altar, and indispensable for the sacrifice. In the sacrament, the refreshing of the Christian is equally represented by the reception of the species of bread only, or of wine only, or of both. To give food to any one is equivalent to giving him the means of life.

Now the Church having the right, (as we have already proved, chap. x. n. vi.) to make all such regulations and modifications, with regard to the dispensing of the sacraments, as she may judge more conducive to the spiritual good of the faithful, and more suited to the dignity of the sacraments themselves, on the condition of not touching their substance—had the power to decide, according as circumstances made it fitting, that the host alone, or the cup alone, or the host and the cup together should be presented to the guests of the Holy Table.

This is precisely what she has done. To infants, on the day of their baptism, she has sometimes accorded the species of wine alone; to the sick, to those who abstained from wine, she has given the species of bread alone; as to the priests themselves in the office of Good Friday, called the *Mass of the pre-sanctified*, she often, particularly in the first ages, distributed the two simultaneously. But

the passing of the cup from mouth to mouth, especially on days when there was a numerous concourse of people, and the embarrassment of an eager crowd, so often occasioned deplorable profanations, awakened so much repugnance, made communion so difficult in certain countries, where there is a deficiency of wine, that it was necessary to resolve to give only the species of bread, henceforward, to the faithful and to priests, who communicate without celebrating. In authorizing this custom the Church wished to provide both for the respect due to the Holy Sacrament, and for the profit of the faithful, for whom frequent communion is thus made more easy. With regard then to dispensing the Eucharist, she has done for just reasons, what she had every right to do, and what she does every day without any objection being raised, in the administration of the other sacraments, particularly that of Extreme Unction.

It is unnecessary to add, that according to St. Jerome, St. Augustine, the venerable Bede[1] and others, Jesus Christ Himself followed this method in giving Himself to His disciples at Emmaus, under the form of bread alone; that, according to the Acts of the Apostles, the faithful continued in the "communion of the breaking of bread;"[2] that at Troas they assembled on the Sunday, around St. Paul, "to break bread with him;"[3] &c., passages which, according to the Fathers, speak of Eucharistic Communion, and yet make no mention of the species of wine. During the three centuries of persecution, the faithful used to preserve the Eucharist at their homes under the species of bread only, as is attested by Tertullian,[4] St. Cyprian,[5] and Eusebius.[6] We learn from St. Basil,[7] that, at a later period, this was the custom of the monks and anchorites.

[1] St. Jerome, *in Epitaph. Paulæ ad Eustoch.* n. 8. St. Augustine, *de Cons. Evangelist*, lib. iii. c. 25. n. 72. Bede, in *Luc.* xxiv.
[2] Acts ii. 42. [3] Acts xx. 7. [4] *Ad uxorem* l. ii. c. 5.
[5] *Serm. de lapsis* [6] *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 36. [7] *Epist.* xciii.

Calvin, therefore, was constrained to admit that we had the custom of the early Church on our side:[1] and on their part, Melancthon, Brentius, and afterwards a synod at Charenton, believed that, in certain cases, they could permit communion under the species of bread only.

The urgency then with which the apostles of the Reformation claimed the use of the cup, was inspired either by that spirit of contradiction which made Luther say: "If a Council was to order or to permit the two kinds we should only take one, or we should take none, and we should curse those, who in virtue of this ordinance took the two;"[2] or rather by an erroneous way of understanding the Real Presence. And the Church, in maintaining her discipline in its integrity, and in reserving to the Pope the decision of the cases in which the use of the chalice might be granted, had especially in view the protection of the Catholic dogma. Accordingly, Paul III., when he granted the Bohemians the use of the cup for a time, imposed, as an express condition, that they should acknowledge, that under the species of bread there is also the blood, and under the species of wine the body of the Redeemer.

A second consequence of transubstantiation is the permanence of the Eucharistic presence of Jesus Christ, which the Lutherans represent as realized at a special point of time for the Communion, and ceasing when that is over. All tradition protests against this unheard of way of understanding those truthful words: "This is my body, This is my blood." From the earliest ages, the Eucharist was carried to the absent by the deacons,[3] reserved for the sick,[4] guarded as a precious treasure by the laity at their homes,[5] and preserved in the churches,[6] in *ciboria*, tabernacles in the form of doves and of little

[1] *Inst.* l. iv, c. 17.
[2] *Form. Missæ.*
[3] St. Justin, *Apol.*, c. i. n. 67.
[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vi. c. 44.
[5] Cyprian, *de lapsis.*
[6] *Const. Apost.*, l. viii, c. 13.

towers. The Office of the Pre-sanctified, in which the priest alone communicates with a host consecrated the previous day, likewise may be traced to the highest antiquity.

The third consequence is that Jesus Christ should be adored in the Eucharist; a duty perfectly understood and practised by the Church of the first ages, as the innovators agree.

To conclude. From the texts of the Fathers and the liturgies which we now have rapidly gone over, we may establish, without any farther discussion, the following propositions, which are a summary of the doctrine of the Council of Trent·

1. Jesus Christ is really and truly present under the Eucharistic species. He is there by virtue of the miraculous change of the substance of the bread and of the wine into His Body and Blood, and He is there permanently. He ought consequently to be the object of our adorations there, to be received not only with faith, but with charity; and as He is *living* under the sacramental sign, whatever be the extent and the form of that sign, He is received entire under either the one or the other species.

2. The Eucharistic oblation, which we call the Mass, is a true sacrifice, propitiatory for the living and the dead, validly celebrated by the priest, even though the faithful, invited to communion by the Church, do not respond to her call.

V.

The analogy of this Mystery with the dogmas, the morals, the discipline, and the worship of Christianity.

We have shown that we possess our Emmanuel present in our temples, offered on our altars, distributed at the Holy Table, as the food of our souls. The advantages which result to us from this intimate communication

with the Author of our salvation are beyond our powers of appreciation. Let us endeavor to point out a few.

The Royal Prophet said: "The merciful and gracious Lord has made a memorial of His wonderful works; He has given food to them that fear Him."[1]

This food, which is the summing up and the memorial of all the wonderful works of the God of infinite mercies, is the manna of the desert, but in a higher sense the Eucharist, of which the manna was the figure. Now, religion offers some wonders to be believed by us; others to be wrought out by our conduct. Those which we are to believe have the Eucharist as their living symbol: those which we are to practise receive in the Eucharist a necessary and supremely efficacious principle of action.

God is *one*, *immense*, *eternal;* so our faith tells us. Our sacrifice, which is identical with that of the cross; which, like it and with it, was represented and figured by all the oblations of the old law, by all the holocausts accepted by God since the sin of the first man; which is and always will be offered on some one of the points of the globe at every instant throughout all ages, is assuredly, by its unity, its immensity, its perpetuity, the most perfect memorial of the divine unity, immensity, eternity.

In the unity of His divine nature, God is *Father*, *Son and Holy Ghost;* and the sacrifice of our altars which is begun, carried on and finished in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, while the sublime liturgy unceasingly proclaims: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost!—what is it in reality but the sacrifice offered by the Son of God, present in His humanity, to the glory and justice of the Father, of the Son Himself, and of the Holy Spirit? A symbol full of reality, a living memorial of the ineffable communication of the divine nature of the Father to the Son, and of the Father and the Son to the Holy Ghost!

[1] Memoriam fecit mirabilium suorum misericors et miserator Dominus; escam dedit timentibus se. *Ps.* cx.

God is *almighty*, says the Apostles' Creed; mighty, says the Eucharistic symbol, to such a degree as to change, when He will, the innermost substance o the beings which He has created; . . . to such a degree as to operate that miracle as great as creation without anything of that change being apparent to the senses; . . . to such a degree as to produce this change not only by the voice of His Word, but by the instrumentality of His most unworthy ministers; to such a degree as to make our Emmanuel present on our altars, without multiplying or dividing His sacred body. Nowhere, assuredly, does the omnipotence of God show itself more prodigal of miracles than in this mystery.

But here His power is placed entirely at the service of *love*. Oh! how good is He, how infinitely good, this God of the Tabernacle, of the Altar, of the Holy Table! good beyond all measure! good even to excess. *He loved them to the end!* good to such a degree as to the prodigal Himself! of a fecundity, a magnificence inexhaustible in His gifts—good to such a degree as to give Himself to us for meat and drink, in order that being assimilated to Him, we may live on Him, in Him, for Him, as He lives by His Father and for His Father!—Love is proved by the good it does to the beloved object; the Eucharist gives us the Author Himself of all good. Love makes distances disappear, treats difficulties as trifles, throws a veil over the defects of the person beloved, aspires to union, to unity; now this is what is done in a super-excellent degree by the God of the Eucharist, of whom especially we say that He is the *good God*. For our language has reserved to God present on our altars those expressions, so touching and so sublime in their simplicity: *To carry, to accompany, to receive the good God!*

And yet, God is *just*. The altar, where the sacrifice of the cross is always present and actual, reveals the divine justice in its extreme rigor. The altar tells us that the justice of God required a perfect satisfaction for sin;

that having found a victim of infinite value, He gave that victim up to all the agonies of the most cruel and torturing death; that this sacrifice must always and everywhere be celebrated under the eye of God, in order to disarm His wrath; and that, nevertheless, sinners are only justified on condition of their repenting, doing penance, and thus applying to themselves the merits of the "Lamb of God, laden with the sins of the world!"[1] *Just Father, the world hath not known Thee!* exclaimed Jesus Christ, when He was preparing His sacrifice.

And what *wisdom* in the reconciliation of this perfect justice and this infinite love! How simple and how fruitful a means has the Lord been able to find, in order to satisfy His dignity, His majesty, His glory, His justice, and to provide for our infirmity, our needs; to purify our senses, and to detach us from them; to exercise and to reward our faith; to apply healing to our wounds; to place our ransom in our own hands; to neutralize the deadly influence of the blood of Adam by infusing a blood more pure and more generous; to attach to Himself through Jesus Christ all regenerated nature! For if all the creatures inferior to man, created for him, and designed to be his nourishment. so soon as they become his food are transformed into him, assimilated to him, and identified with him; man in his turn, when fed by the Eucharist, is united, incorporated, assimilated to Jesus Christ;—to Jesus Christ, who thus makes all creation redeemed by His blood, live by His life, while He Himself lives by that divine life which He receives eternally from the Father.

Thus is the Eucharist the sacred and everlasting covenant which unites to the Creator His beloved creature; the delightful consummation of that union of God with our humanity of which the Incarnation is the principle, and Christian marriage the figure. Thus, by the Eucharistic Communion, is especially realized that law of the

[1] Joan. xvii. 25.

harmony of beings which the Apostle formulates in the words: "All things are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's."[1] Thus is obtained that mysterious unity and that consummation in unity which Jesus Christ asked and obtained for us: *I in them and thou in Me; that they be made perfect in one.*[2] Thus by the intervention of man's free concurrence, is affected that union with God which is the definite object of his existence, as it is that of all beings. They have gone forth from God to diffuse themselves in time and space; God recalls them into the infinite bosom of His eternal love that He may be *all in all.* Such, according to the most ancient ideas of the human race, is the last word of the creation.[3]

The Eucharist then expresses to us in divine language, the unity and the trinity, the goodness and the justice, the power and the wisdom, the eternity and the immensity of our God. But within man himself there are other mysteries, which the Eucharistic sacrifice and communion will reveal to us not less clearly.

The voice of the Word produced the *creation* of men. The Priest at the altar is daily associated in a similar operation, when becoming the oragn of the Word, he produces instantaneously the presence of the humanity of Christ, who nevertheless has not left the heavens or the thousands of tabernacles which he inhabits on our earth.

Man, miserable creature, sinned almost as soon as he came forth out of nothing. The altar, where sin is expi-

[1] Omnia vestra sunt, vos autem Christi, Christus autem Dei. 1 *Cor.* iii. 23.

[2] Joan. xvii. 23.

[3] Gerbet, *Dogme generateur*, p. 84. The expression is St. Paul's (*Ad Ephes.* i. 23, and iv. 6). To secure its being properly understood we will remind you that the fourth Council of Lateran, under Innocent III. condemned the following propositions of Amalric: "Mentem contemplativi vel beati perdere suum esse in proprio genere et redire in illud esse ideale quod habuit in mente divina: deinde omnes creaturas in fine in Deum redituras et in ipsum converti, ut sint unum individuum cum ipso."

ated, is everywhere and at all times, the witness, the accuser, or rather the repairer and the avenger of sin.

Sin merits *death*. Accordingly it is a victim that you see on the altar; a victim in a state which tends to destruction, with His flesh prepared to be our food, and His blood to be drunk by us.

By his union with Jesus Christ, the sinner is *justified*. The Eucharistic communion produces, cements, consummates this life-giving union. Owing to it, the voluntary victim of sin and the repentant sinner are henceforward one; and the justice of God is appeased on seeing within us a pure blood poured out, a propitiatory death undergone, an infinite satisfaction voluntarily offered. The Communion makes the victim offered for the salvation of our soul and body pass into our understanding by faith, into our heart by love, into all our senses by real manducation; and, while our sins and the penalty they deserve, are in some sort turned aside on the Saviour, He pours into us His grace which penetrates us, His justice which becomes ours, His rights to glory which He shares with us.

In virtue of these rights, the Christian ought to *rise from the dead*. The Eucharist gives us pledges, earnests, an assured principle of resurrection. How, in fact, could we, nourished by Him who is the *resurrection and the life*, who gives to the guests at His table *eternal life*, who has said: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, I will raise him up at the last day," how could we be eternally the prey of death? That dead food should maintain in our bodies a mortal and dying life, could not but be; but that the Life Itself, becoming our food, should allow us to perish; that this heavenly viaticum, which is Itself the way, should permit us to fail in our journey from time to eternity,—no! this cannot be. We may then sleep tranquilly in that sleep of the senses, which in christian language is called our passing (transitus), or our birth (natalis). That slumber will be short: and soon

will He who raised Lazarus, who arose Himself, and who has given us to eat the resurrection and the life, soon will He awaken us, to clothe us with His glory, and to associate us in His eternal blessedness.

But, after all, what is that *eternal life* which is proposed to us as our last end, our supreme happiness, our recompense infinitely great? Enquire of the Eucharist. The temporary enjoyment which we procure at the sacred banquet is a figure of the eternal enjoyment which awaits us in heaven: thus the Church expresses herself: *the temporal reception prefigures the eternal fruition.*[1] "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life," was said by our Saviour; he has the germ of it, he possesses a beginning, an outline, a foretaste of it. Let us call to mind what passes between Jesus and ourselves at the holy Table. He is in us and we in Him; His blood flows in our veins; His heart pulsates on our heart; His soul has penetrated and transformed ours; and what heavenly peace, what delicious inebriation, provided our hearts be pure! what holy pleasure, what happiness unknown to earth, diffuses itself together with Him through our whole being! . . . Ah well! suppose that the Eucharistic veil is torn asunder, that the time of trial gives place to the eternal day of recompense, that the obstacles which our unworthiness opposes to a perfect communication here below, disappear; that thenceforward the enjoyment of God is full, entire, assured, consummated, ever springing up anew and ever satiated, worthy of the Infinite Being who gives Himself, and even anticipating the desires, exceeding the perceptions of the soul . . . . you will have some idea of heaven, and of the intoxicating abundance of its good things, of the blessedness of a soul introduced into the joy of Jesus Christ, seated at His banquet, invited to His marriage feast, sharing His inheritance and His throne, living with His eternally happy life. "If, while the Divine substance

[1] *Missa in festo Corporis Christi. Postcom.*

unites itself to our substance, God transformed, in the same proportion, our intelligence into His intelligence, and our will into His love, then," says M. Gerbet,[1] "we should see Him face to face, and should love Him with a love corresponding to that clear vision. Heaven is nothing else than this. Let us wait a little: the day of transformation approaches. As the infant, by an instinct of self-preservation, attaches itself to its mother's breast, from which it receives life, before it has opened its eyes to the light, so is man fed on God before he sees Him. Such is the universal order of Providence; for in all things there is a substantial union which precedes the union of intelligence and will. But soon the child knows the authors of its life, as it is known by them, and makes but one and the same soul with them. So when we have gone out of this world, as out of our cradle, this union, begun on earth, will be consummated; and God, penetrating our whole being at once with His power, will be in us and we in Him, according to all that He is, and all that we are capable of being."

Thus the creation of man, called out of nothing by the command of the Word; his sin which has made him subject to death; his justification by his union to his Redeemer; his future resurrection and his introduction to glory; all these dogmas which reveal to us our origin, our duties, our destinies, are recalled, explained, made present to us by the one single dogma of the Eucharist.

But "no one cometh to the Father except by the Son;" and we ought farther to see the whole christian doctrine relating to Jesus Christ summed up in the Mystery of Faith.[2]

Jesus Christ is *God*. The Eucharist makes us adore Him daily, under the sacramental veil, with that absolute worship of *latria* which is due to God alone, and which we cannot, without sacrilege, give to any creature.

[1] Dogme generateur, p. 79. [2] Mysterium Fidei. *Liturg.*

Jesus is *man*. Accordingly His virginal *flesh* is given us to eat and His *blood* to drink.

Jesus is *God-man* in the unity of His divine person. This is precisely what is attested by the worship of adoration which we pay to His flesh. For it to merit this, it is absolutely necessary that it belong to God, that it be placed under His personality, under His dominion. "Let no one eat that flesh," says St. Augustine,[1] "without having first adored."

After His thirty years of solitude at Nazareth, after having, for three years, multiplied cures and consolations and miracles of every kind, for the relief of the suffering, Jesus, to complete *the work of our redemption*, immolated His humanity on the cross. The solitude of the tabernacle recalls only too well that of Nazareth. All the cures daily wrought by the Communion, all the wounds which it closes, the consolation and light it diffuses, all the favors received at the foot of the holy tabernacle, make us participate in the beneficent passage of Jesus over the earth. As to His sacrifice on the cross it is perpetually rendered present on our altars, and made actual in all its reality, with all its merits, of which the application is continued unceasingly. At the altar, as on Calvary, Jesus Christ is both sacrificer and victim; the immolation is made for the same ends; the circumstances and the manner of immolation alone differ. This difference disappears, if we compare the Eucharistic sacrifice with that of the paschal supper-room.

"Thus," says Mœhler,[2] "the Saviour has not disappeared from among us; but ever living in His Church, He there reveals His presence under sensible forms. In the preaching of His word He is Himself the eternal teacher; by the administration of the sacraments He associates to Himself man regenerated in the waters of baptism, He pardons the sinner, He strengthens those that are growing

[1] Nemo carnem illam manducet, nisi prius adoraverit.

[2] *Symbolique*, l. i. § 34.

up, He blesses the union of the espoused, He unites Himself in the Eucharist to all those who sigh after the blessed life; it is He that consoles and encourages the dying; it is He that consecrates the human organs through whom His unwearied goodness diffuses all these benefits, all these graces. But if Jesus Christ, hidden under an earthly veil, is to continue to the end the work which He has begun on earth, it follows that he offers Himself to the Father for the human race in all times. We ought then to find in His Church the living representation of that sacrifice. . . . Thus, in the august mystery, the Lamb of God is the victim of propitiation for the sins of the world. But let us form to ourselves a very precise idea of the sacrifice. In truth, His immolation on the cross is but a part of one vast whole, to which belong all His life, all His actions, all His sufferings, and which form with His death but one immense sacrifice offered by His love and mercy. This grand act is made up, it is true, of many parts, but no one of its parts constitutes the *chef-d'-œuvre* of the divine goodness. The will of Christ to give Himself to us on our altars, enters also into this great immolation. for it is counted among the merits which are imputed to us. The sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, though it is a true sacrifice, ought not to be separated from the life of the Saviour, as we see clearly by the very object of its institution. In this last part of His sacrifice, Jesus Christ makes over to us all that He has hitherto done for us; His immolation from being objective becomes subjective; appropriated to each of us individually. The Redeemer immolating Himself upon the cross is still a stranger to us, He remains at a distance from us; by the Eucharistic immolation and communion, He becomes our own property, our own victim. On the cross He gives Himself for all; on the altar, at the holy Table, He gives Himself to each one of us. On Calvary He is simply a victim; in our temples He is a victim

acknowledged, adored, and made the food, the viaticum of each one of the faithful."

Jesus Christ, three days after His bloody immolation, *rose again*. This was necessary, for we can only offer in sacrifice to God a living victim.

He has *ascended to heaven*, there to make the felicity, the glory of the saints. The Eucharist, wherein, all veiled as He is, He makes the happiness and the perfection of faithful souls even at present, leads us to believe in, and to hope for that blessedness which He enjoys, and which He causes His elect to enjoy at the right hand of the Father.

The dogma of the Eucharist, therefore, declares, or rather renders present to our faith, the divinity, the humanity, the incarnation, the immolation on the cross, the resurrection, the heavenly glory of Jesus Christ.

Thus is the Eucharist an epitome of all the mysteries of religion, that relate to God, to man, to the Man-God: it explains them, makes them present to our minds, and still more to our hearts, and gives us to taste their happy fruits. It is indeed a living "memorial of the wonderful works of the God of all goodness and mercies."[1] It is truly, as the Church says at the solemn moment of the consecration, the mystery of the faith, of the whole Christian faith: *Mysterium Fidei!*

There are other marvels which religion commands us to bring forth; such are good works, the excellent fruits of our belief. These marvels, which nature alone could not realize, are rendered possible only by grace, that is abundant, ever present, and of extraordinary efficacy. Now this grace is attached to a worthy participation in the Holy Mysteries.

It is in our moral as in our physical nature. In order to have strength to support severe labors for a long time, the body needs a certain quantity of food of a suitable quality. That our soul may bear resolutely the yoke of

[1] Ps. cx. 4.

the christian law, it needs the Eucharist as its food, its nourishment.

Jesus Christ said: "He that eateth me shall live by me." . . "he abideth in me and I in him."[1] And in another place: "He that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit."[2] . . and "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you."[3] . . This is saying with sufficient clearness that the bread of life is the fruitful sap, the necessary support, the indispensable aliment of the christian life. The Apostle, exhorting the Hebrews, who had become Christians, to an inviolable purity, to complete detachment from the goods of this world, to the resolute firmness of martyrdom, to the love of humiliations and crosses, to virtues, which up to that time were unknown or very rare, justifies his requiring them by the words: "We have an altar," and on that altar a victim,"whereof they have no power to eat, who serve the tabernacle."[4]

Elsewhere the Apostle sums up in three words the entire duties of Christian morality: *Sobrie, et juste, et pie vivamus in hoc sæculo*, he says;[5] piety towards God, justice and charity towards our neighbors, sobriety, temperance, purity, mortification towards ourselves.

Piety, according to its exact definition, is *a filial love* of God. Religion makes us adore God as our creator, fear inclines us to serve Him as our judge; hope leads us to desire Him as our recompense, piety makes us love Him as our Father. A man who is without piety is deprived of the character of a child of God; he is in the condition of a slave, or a hireling; he will not have a share in the inheritance of the children, he does not belong to the family, he is unacquainted with its enjoyments; he is a Jew or a Gentile, he is not a Christian.

But how can poor and miserable creatures conceive this *filial love* of God, and make it grow in their hearts? The

[1] Joan. vi. 57 and 58. [2] Joan. xv. 5. [3] Joan. vi. 54.
[4] Hebr. xiii. 10. [5] Tit. ii. 12.

true means is this: God has one Son, His only Son; and this Son loves Him with the most perfect filial love. By the Incarnation this Son has become the son of man, and by the Eucharist He becomes the daily food of the christian and the life of his heart. It is therefore from a union ever more and more intimate with the only Son of God, that we must draw the affectionate sentiments, the tender love, the absolute devotedness, the intimate confidence, the reverential familiarity of a son towards a father, in one word, true piety.

St. Francis of Sales calls participation in the holy mysteries the soul of piety, the heart of devotion, the centre of the christian religion, the sun of spiritual exercises.

A theologian of our own day, at once a philosopher, a distinguished writer and a poet, whom we have already quoted several times, has proved with as much solidity as elevation and grace of thought and expression, that the doctrine of the Eucharist is "the principle that generates piety." But this fascinating subject must be studied in the work itself. "The Gospel," observes Mgr. Gerbet,[1] "has made a revolution in the human soul. Fear has yielded the empire of the heart to love. The God of gods having humbled Himself so far as to become our Friend, our Brother, our Servant, frail humanity has been raised to a kind of familiarity with the Almighty, of which the ancients had not even an idea, and which would have seemed to them a presumptuous sacrilege. This sentiment is the salient, the characteristic feature of christian nations as compared with other people. But they do not all share in it to the same degree. It is visibly weakened among Protestants, and that in the same proportion as is their faith in the Real Presence.[2] If the difference which

[1] Dogme générateur, p. 212 and the following pages.

[2] The three principal divisions of Protestantism—Lutheranism, Anglicanism, and Calvinism—are, as regards piety, in relations corresponding to the different degrees of the repugnance they entertain towards the doctrine which generates Catholic piety. . . This law is equally evident in the last of modern heresies, Jansenism. One of the earliest

exists as to sentiments of piety between the ancient people of God and His new people, arise from the fact that Christ has familiarized man with God, the difference which distinguishes Catholic devotion from Protestant formality is derived from an analagous principle, and supposes that Catholics are more familiar with Christ Himself. It is, in fact, the result of faith in the Real Presence, or the permanent incarnation which brings us near to Christ, as the incarnation has brought us near to God. It is no longer to humanity in general, it is to each human being that Christ unites himself. He enters not merely within the limits of our common nature, but even into the limits of our personality. He makes our essence divine, He christianizes our inmost self. The emblem of His incarnation in us is the union, which transforms food into the very substance of the body, which is nourished by it. Do not ask for a union more intimate; you would be asking to be the Man-God. Who can fail to perceive that a religion founded on such a mystery, must develop, to the highest degree, that sentiment of familiarity with God, which is the foundation and the heart of Christianity? In our admirable prayers for Communion the soul speaks to Jesus as the bride to her beloved; and for her, fear is no longer more than the modesty of confidence."

Towards our neighbor we have the duty of *justice*, of which charity is the perfection. Jesus Christ would have us love our neighbor as ourselves; but that is not sufficient; "as our Heavenly Father loves us, us poor sinners;" or again, "as Jesus Christ Himself has loved us," He who for our sake devoted Himself to the death of the cross; or, in fine, as if the neighbor, whom we ought to love and to assist was His own self. This charity is His *special*

effects of this stern doctrine was to keep men away from the Eucharist. Accordingly the devotion of Jansenism, having an antipathy to the mysteries of love, is at once dry and icy. It proves better by its example than all its reasonings that the *grace* of prayer has *failed* it," p. 229.

precept, His new commandment; and the observance of this law, which is the summing up of all others, is to be the characteristic mark of His disciples. This charity, far from excluding our enemies, ought to have its fervor redoubled towards them; ought to return them good for evil, to pray, to suffer, to make sacrifices for them; and the Lord will not accept our sacrifices till we have done our part to bring back to us the wounded heart of our brother.

Where are we to find love enough for the observance of a law so perfect, so that we may be towards each other, like the primitive Christians, "but one *heart* and one *soul*," and compose but one and the same body animated by one and the same spirit?[1]—At the never failing source of infinite love at the Holy Tabernacle.

There, love feeds and inebriates us; there, self-devotion, sacrifice, surrender of self, charity carried beyond all bounds, diffuse themselves abundantly in our souls; there the heart of Jesus presses our heart to love for Him, with Him, like Him, without measure. We go out of the supper-room to follow Jesus to Calvary, repeating with St. Thomas, "Let us also go that we may die with Him!"—terrible as lions to the powers of hell, says St. John Chrysostom, and breathing only fire, the inextinguishable fire of love!

Would not one drop of the blood of Jesus Christ be sufficient to extinguish in our souls the rising flame of anger or resentment? Could one drop of gall again embitter the heart, which has been embalmed by the heart of God who is love.

The sign of a good communion, we are told by St. Francis of Sales, is progress in gentleness and meekness.

But does nature seem ready to give way under the ever-renewed pressure of labor and of suffering? Well! one fervent communion revives it, inflames it with new fire,

[1] Cor unum et anima, uno. Unum corpus, unus spiritus. *Act.* iv. 32; *Ephes.* iv. 4.

and repluces it on the way of martyrdom; and St. Francis Xavier pursues his unwearied course, saying: "The greatest suffering of the missionary is his being unable, under certain circumstances, to celebrate the holy mysteries, and being deprived of the heavenly bread which strengthens the heart of man and forms his only consolation among the ills and crosses of life." And St. Vincent of Paul finishes one of his pious foundations, and returning to his priests, says: "When you have received the adorable Body of Jesus Christ, do you not feel a divine fire burning in your breasts?" And the daughter of Vincent, the humble Sister of Charity, in vain called back by the remembrance of all the comforts she has quitted, flies, as an angel of consolation, to the bedside of the dying, binds up their loathsome wounds, receives their last sigh, and lays out their cold remains. Communion, frequent Communion! behold the principle inspiring all the devotedness of Catholic charity: behold the fuel of that fire which Jesus Christ has sent upon the earth, and which ought to consume it; behold the great gift which God Himself imparts to us, and which puts us under an obligation to give up in return not only our fortune, our quiet, our time, our health, but our whole heart, our whole life, our whole being! He who has not drawn charity from this source will not understand our words; neither will he understand those charitable institutions, that are grouped in such numbers around our tabernacles. We shall find him confounding this theological virtue, which makes us love God for His own sake and our neighbor for God's sake, with benevolence, philanthropy, humanity,—virtues merely moral and philosophical. He may give his money, but will he give himself? He may distribute Bibles far and wide, found schools, organize charitable institutions, levy and distribute poor-rates; will he ever attempt to make himself a missionary martyr, a hospital brother, a follower of St. Vincent of Paul? What is lacking to him for going

as far as this, is the strength which is only given by the bread of life.

"Charity is of God," St. John teaches, "If you would know how it is produced and how preserved, ask its heroes and heroines. They will tell you that this virtue lives on a word of faith, which they receive at the confessional, every week or every fortnight; that it is vivified and inflamed by contact with God, who is love, in frequent communion."[1]

Again, whence comes it that sacerdotal continence, religious virginity, are sacrifices unknown where the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is not celebrated? These acts of self-devotion are the fruits of charity, but also of that other virtue, which regulates our duties towards ourselves, and which the Apostle calls *sobriety.* This christian temperance excludes all that is irregular in sensual gratifications, moderates the use of permissible enjoyments, labors to mortify and to destroy in us every principle of irregularity and disorder. Jesus Christ has declared war against flesh and blood, and has expressly excluded them from the kingdom of heaven. He reserves that celestial royalty for those who know how to do violence to themselves, to overcome, to renounce, to lose, to sacrifice themselves, to bear their cross daily, and to follow Him in the path of privation and suffering. He blesses marriage when restored to its original laws of unity and indissolubility; while yet virginity is in His eyes a more perfect state; but He intends that this sign of His union with His Church should always be holy and pure: *Marriage honorable.—The bed undefiled,* says the Apostle,—He proscribes avarice and solicitude for the goods of this world: *Let your manners be without covetousness, contented with such things as you have.*—By His example and His words, He recommends the virtue of abstinence and fasting. In short He wishes His mystical members to be able to adapt themselves to a Head crowned with thorns, to Feet and Hands pierced with

[1] *Solution de grands problèmes,* t. iv. p. 24.

nails, to a Tongue moistened with gall and vinegar, to a Heart pierced with a spear. But all this is possible only on one condition: that is, that the new Adam should vouchsafe to purify our flesh by contact with His own, and to diffuse through our veins His own pure and generous blood; that the Son of Mary should come to combat and neutralize in us the deadly influence of the blood of Adam, that He should inebriate us with that "wine which makes virgins spring forth."[1] We shall be Angels if we are fed with the bread of Angels; we shall not regret the onions of Egypt, when we have been filled with heavenly manna; on leaving the table of God we shall not go to sit down at the table of devils. But if you set aside the Eucharist, you must set aside at the same time abstinence, fasting, the indissolubility of the conjugal bond, the devotedness of virginity and religious poverty, the practices of mortification, and in general all the holy austerity of the evangelical law. The Church of Jesus Christ will not be more pure than the Synagogue; our holiness will not exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees. Our Lord has said that "what is born of the flesh is flesh" . . . and that we "do not gather grapes from thorns."[2]

Thus while the one single doctrine of the Eucharist is the epitome of our whole faith, the one single devotion of that adorable mystery makes us observe the whole of christian morality: and all the marvels of religion, as well those which we are to believe as those which we are to realize by our actions, emanate from this one great marvel, which is, as it were, the principle that generates and preserves them: *Memoriam fecit mirabilium suorum misericors et miserator Dominus; escam dedit timentibus se.*

What I have said of morals might with equal truth be said of Catholic worship and discipline. All the splendor

[1] Zach. ix. 27.

[2] Quod natum est ex carne caro est. Joan. iii. 6. Numquid colligunt de spinis uvas? *Matth.* vii. 16.

and dignity of our worship, the magnificence of its temples, the beauty and variety of its ceremonies, the choice works which it unceasingly demands from architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry, eloquence, and all the arts; those efforts, so prodigious in the countries and ages of faith, efforts to raise up to the very clouds the dwelling of God on earth, to surround the Eucharistic victim with incense, hymns and flowers; all these monuments of a faith and a love which never say, *That is enough*, have their foundation in a belief in the Real Presence and in the Sacrifice accomplished upon our altars. We pray, we prostrate ourselves, we adore, we chaunt, because HE is there! It is because HE is there that the lamp burns, the clouds of incense rise, the organ makes its thousand voices heard; His Presence tolerates not in His temple anything profane, His sacrifice calls for the pomp, the majesty, the gravity of the most imposing ceremonies.—To the accents of the deacon, who proclaims the Gospel, to the solemn tones of the Preface, and the affecting chaunt of the *Pater*, the assembly can only reply by unanimous and prolonged acclamations. "Is it then," asks M. Vinet, "is it then solely owing to the Real Presence that the Catholic temples are real temples? Yes, assuredly; . . and do what you will, your Protestant chapels will never be more than lecture-rooms. But, as you have yourselves said, preaching is not worship."[1]

The Catholic Church preaches also; but above all she prays, she blesses, she adores. She knows all the great, the divine transactions which are done upon her altars; she therefore obeys with eager readiness the command of her Spouse: "Make the preparations (for the new, the Christian Passover) in a large room, furnished, which will be shown you."[2] She has entered into the thought of our divine Lord when he accepted the costly perfumes

[1] *Theolog. pastorale.* Le Culte, p. 215.

[2] Vobis demonstrabit cænaculum grande, stratum; et illic parate nobis. Marc. xiv. 15.

which Magdalene poured upon His feet, to embalm Him as it were, in advance, when He justified her pious prodigality against the impertinent murmurings of Judas. Viewing the magnificence of the ancient temple, which was but a shadow of a figure, she asks herself, what ought the new sanctuary to be, which is inhabited by the Godhead in person, and is a far more perfect figure of the heavenly Jerusalem. Moreover, was it not the object of the Incarnation, to bring home to our minds and hearts, by the medium of the senses, the teachings, the graces and the satisfactions of the God-Man? The externals of worship propose the same end. In the Catholic idea, they are, we may say, a permanent transfiguration of the Word made flesh, concealed, even annihilated in the mystery of His love. To make the sanctuary a Thabor as brilliant as possible, and for this end to venture on all that is within the limit of human power, *quantum potes tantum aude*,—this is her object and her rule.

But worship is made especially pious, attractive, salutary, edifying for man, and glorious to the Godhead, by the eager concourse of the faithful who come to mingle their adorations and their prayers. The Church makes it a law for all her children to go, every Sunday, to take part in the sacrifice which she celebrates. It is evident that the only motive which could justify this eminently social law and make it observed, is faith in the Real Presence and in the inexhaustible merit of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

"Generally speaking, in those forms of worship, which exclude tradition and the Real Presence, the ancient precept of attending regularly at divine service on the Lord's day has lost its character of law, and is at most only considered as a counsel, subordinate to the varying conveniences of each individual. In fact, what necessity can there be for a Protestant to attend regularly at his place of worship? Has he not the Bible at home, and does he not possess the right of interpreting it? Has he any need

to pray to God by the mouth of a minister? In a system founded on individualism why should a human being intervene between him and his God? His home ought to be his temple, as his reason is his priest. The manifest tendency of Protestantism to concentrate itself in a domestic worship would be a transition to a purely individual worship, the only one that is really in harmony with the logical principle of Protestantism.

For Catholics, on the contrary, social worship is, as it was at the beginning, a necessary condition of religion. They are obliged to assemble together frequently in the temple, in order to find there what can be found no where else, the two-fold tradition of truth and of the mysteries of love. The Real Presence, the living centre of public worship, vivifies it by an ever active attraction, at the same time that it exalts it to the highest sublimity, to which worship can attain on earth. The magnificence of Catholicity which spiritualizes the very senses, and the rude nakedness of Calvinism may be considered as the two extreme points, between which are found different liturgies more or less poor in proportion, as the doctrine they represent is nearer to or farther from the Catholic mystery. All the ceremonies of the Church converge towards this centre of grace, in the same manner that in temples constructed by christian genius all the lines of the architecture are arranged with reference to the sanctuary. This is the reason that Catholic worship, the expression of boundless love, as the creation is the manifestation of infinite power, affects the heart as vividly as the magnificence of nature astonishes the understanding."[1]

The discipline of the Catholic Church, like its worship and its morals, has the Tabernacle for its basis and support. The difference of the functions to be fulfilled for our Emmanuel is what establishes the distinction of grades in the ecclesiastical hierarchy; the minister serves at the altar, the priest consecrates, the bishop gives the power

[1] Dogme générateur, p. 135.

of consecrating. It is Eucharistic Communion that makes possible, easy and sweet, that perpetual continence which by a rule so holy is imposed on all the sacred orders; a solemn vow which opens the entrance to the Sanctuary only to chosen souls, and preserves for the service of God and His Church all the interests of their hearts, all the energy of their affections and of their devotedness.

We must attribute to the same cause that sacrifice, religious virginity, which places at the service of the Church, wherever the Church is free, so great a number of heroic and generous souls, and devotes them to all the exercises of piety, charity and penitence. Accordingly, in order to maintain religious institutions in their fervor, or to bring them back to their primitive purity, the Council of Trent prescribes, in the first place, communion at least every month.[1] This, it says, would be "the health-giving aliment of their piety, and their invincible defence against the assaults of the enemy."

But, "let a man prove himself before eating of that bread and drinking of that chalice." "This proof," says the Council, "consists in this, that no christian having his conscience burdened by a mortal sin, however great his contrition may appear to himself to be, should dare to approach the holy Table without being previously purified by the bath of penitence."[2] Confession, then, the inestimable advantages of which we shall have to speak of presently, is the test required by the custom of the Church,[3] from every priest and every layman, who discovers a stain on his soul, when he is invited by the God of angels to His table or His altar. It is in that sacred bath that he must renew the brightness of the wedding-garment. A sick man needs medicine first, and afterwards he will enjoy wholesome food. Custom, on this point more strict than law, brings daily to the confessional a multitude of pure souls, who seek to purify

[1] Sess. xxv. c. 10, and Sess. xxiii. c. 18.

[2] Sess. xiii. c. 7, and can. 11.

[3] Sess. xiii. c. 7, and can. 11.

themselves still more. None of the faithful, after several weeks of absence from it, would venture to present himself at the sacred banquet without having made us the judges of his fitness. "Thus," says Mgr. Gerbet,[1] "all is social in Catholicity: and the greatest gift of divine love is entrusted, not to the individual, but to the Church. She alone is the depository of it, as she alone is of the word of truth. Before approaching the Holy of holies, the individual conscience submits itself to the power of the religious society in the person of one of its ministers, who pronounces the sentence of grace. The sanctuary opens; and repentance delivered from remorse, and innocence which has gained confidence in itself from the judgment of authority, go together during the public prayers, to place themselves at the common banquet of all the just. Thus it is that the faithful christian is not admitted to this intimate communication with Christ except by drawing tighter the bands which unite him to the Church, the common country of all christians; and the greatest act of the mystic life is itself a great social action."

The most essential rules, then, of the discipline of the Catholic Church, the most important precepts of its morals, the excellence and the organic laws of its worship, all rest or are supported on the altar. . . This is not all. The most severe and most effectual sanction of the whole christian law, is also derived from faith in this same precious mystery. This sanction, which the greatest potentates have dreaded, is called *excommunication*. The fear of this terrible punishment, or the necessity of obtaining its remission, has prevented or remedied, especially in the ages of faith, an infinity of evils, wars, exactions, defections, scandals. How many kings have been brought back to moderation and justice, how many ecclesiastics to the observance of the holy canons, how many marriages to fidelity, how many hostile nations to con-

[1] *Dogme générateur*, p. 116.

cord and peace, how many rebellious subjects to obedience, by the fear of excommunication! Now this chastisement, the most justly dreaded of all that the Church inflicts, is essentially an exclusion from the Eucharistic feast. "I say unto you, that not one of those men shall taste of My Supper." It was in these terms that our Lord fulminated the first anathema. After Him, the Church, which has received the keys of heaven, and consequently of the tabernacle; the Church, to which the dispensation of the mysteries of God has been committed, when she is obliged to punish great offenders, says to them: "You shall come no more to sit down at the Table of God, whom you have offended; you shall come no more to drink of the chalice of salvation; you shall see your brethren pressing around the feast of their common Father, and you shall remain fasting, condemned to have no other nourishment than the gross food of the body, and so to perish by spiritual inanition, unless your penitence obtain for you the viaticum of the dying.

But let us not make any change in the text of that terrible sentence. It is too remarkable to be replaced by any words of ours; we will give it literally translated from the Roman Pontifical. The Bishop, vested in his robes of mourning, seated as a judge before the high altar, assisted by twelve priests in surplices, bearing, like himself lighted candles, speaks in the following words:[1]

"Inasmuch as N., by the persuasion of the Devil, apostatizing from the Christian promises, which he made at Baptism, is not afraid to lay waste the Church of God, to plunder ecclesiastical property, and violently to oppress the poor of Christ; we, out of our anxiety that he should not perish through our pastoral neglect, for whom we have to give account at the terrible day of judgment, before the Chief Pastor, our Lord Jesus Christ, as the Lord

[1] This form is reserved by the canon law for use *in enormibus delictis et contra tyrannos claves Ecclesiæ contemnentes*. Eveillon, *Traité des Excommunications*, c. 29, art. 1.

Himself has fearfully threatened, saying: "If thou dost not speak to warn the wicked man from his ways, I will require his blood at thy hand;" have admonished him canonically, a first, second, third, yea, a fourth time, to convince him of his wickedness, and have called him to amendment of life, to satisfaction and to penance, and reproved him with the affection of a father. But he, alas! despising the salutary admonitions of the Church which he has injured, puffed up with a spirit of pride, disdains to make satisfaction. Now we are taught by the precepts of our Lord and His Apostles, what we ought to do towards offenders of this kind. For the Lord says: "If thy hand or thy foot scandalize thee, cut it off and cast it from thee." And the Apostle says; "Put away the evil one from among yourselves." And again: "If any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or a server of idols, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one not so much as to eat." And John, the beloved disciple of Christ, forbids us to salute a wicked man of this kind, saying: "Receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you: for he that sayeth unto him, God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works." In obedience then to the commands of our Lord and His Apostles, let us cut off from the body of the Church by the sword of excommunication the putrid and incurable member, which refuses to be healed, that the other members of the body be not infected by this contagious disease, as by poison. Seeing, therefore, that as he has despised our admonitions and frequent exhortations, seeing that he has neither considered his fault nor confessed it, nor sent any excuse by messengers, nor asked pardon, but having his heart hardened by the devil, perseveres still in the wickedness he had begun, in agreement with the saying of the Apostle: "According to his hardness and impenitent heart, he treasures up to himself wrath against the day of wrath;" therefore, by the judgment of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the

Holy Ghost, and by the authority of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and of all the saints, and our own (though unworthy), and by the power of binding and loosing, conferred on us by God, we sever from the reception of the precious Body and Blood of the Lord, and from the society of all christians, and exclude from the threshhold of entrance into our holy mother the Church in heaven and on earth, this man, with all his accomplices and supporters, and decree him to be excommunicated and anathematized; and adjudge him to be condemned to everlasting fire with the devil and his angels, and all the reprobate; until he recover from the snares of the devil, and return to amendment of life and penance, and satisfy the Church of God, which he has injured; delivering him to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of judgment."

All the persons present thrice repeat: *Fiat;* and the Bishop and priests throw their tapers on the ground, tread on and extinguish them.

This separation from the Eucharist, says St. Augustine,[1] is the greatest punishment inflicted by the Church, and among us christians takes the place of the punishment of death which the ancient law inflicted on some crimes. The unhappy man from whom the bread of life has thus been withdrawn will die for want of food. While he lives the faithful ought to avoid him, not to pray, nor eat nor drink with him, they ought to refuse him the kiss of friendship or greeting. If he continues more than a year in his impenitence, he is declared a heretic, he becomes infamous; and at his death is deprived of christian burial.

Let us bring together the observations which have been suggested to us, in this rapid view of the temple in which God dwells among men:

The faithful belief of the one doctrine of the Eucharist is an epitome of all the revealed objects of belief.

[1] Epist. cc. (al. lxxv); Quæst. xxxix. in Deutor.

The regular practice of all the duties which the Eucharist requires alone makes the yoke of christian morality and discipline sweet and easy.

The religious honor given to the Eucharist is itself the whole of our external Catholic worship.

The religious sanction of the law of Jesus in this world is, in its highest form, exclusion from the Eucharistic feast —as, in eternity, that sanction is exclusion from the heavenly feast.

That is to say, this mystery is the memorial, the complement, the preparation or the application of all mysteries; the keystone of the vault of the religious edifice, the focus from which issue all the rays of grace, the centre to which they all converge, the explanation of the past, the perfection of the present, the initiation into the future. It is to say, that Jesus Christ present in our temples, immolated on our altars, given as food in that sacred banquet, is always among us and for us the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the Lamb of God that beareth the sins of the world, the mediator uniting earth to heaven, and the old world to the new, Emmanuel giving glory to the Most High, imparting "peace to men of good will," drawing all to Him from the height of His cross; that He is there, realizing all the relations of God to man and of man to God, making Himself incarnate, immolating Himself, teaching us, incorporating us into Himself, giving us grace, preparing us for glory, already all things in Himself in an ineffable and delightful unity:

It is, in fine, to say, that the invention of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist would of itself alone be equivalent to that of the whole of Christianity.

Luther has acknowledged and proclaimed this truth: "Ecclesiastical hierarchy, colleges, monasteries, temples, chapels, altars, in a word, the whole Church of the Pope, with his sacerdotal kingdom, is built upon the dogma of the Eucharistic sacrifice".[1]

[1] *De Abrog. Mis. priv.*

Suppress it; Jesus Christ draws back to the distance of eighteen centuries; He ascends and hides Himself in the inaccessible heights of heaven; we know not how to initiate ourselves into His life, to apply to ourselves His merits, to make ourselves strong enough to bear His law. The four thousand years which preceded His bloody immolation remain an inexplicable enigma; the ceremony of the supper-room has no longer any significance; His clearest words deceive us, His promises are illusory. The Jewish ritual is in that case infinitely superior to ours, and our churches have nothing to compensate them for not being, like the temple of Jerusalem, the wonders of the world. All religious truths, for want of the tie, which unites them together; of the mirror, which brings them home to us and enables us to comprehend them; fall one by one into oblivion or doubt; all the splendors of Catholic worship and morality gradually disappear; and christian humanity, perishing for lack of nourishment, by the side of a too severe law, from which it has emancipated itself, of an intolerable yoke which it has broken, begins to doubt whether Christ be really its Legislator, its Saviour and its God.

VI.

Summary Explanation of the principal Ceremonies of the Mass.

We have explored the foundations of our temples, we have attempted to measure their dimensions, it remains for us to visit their interior.

But, first of all, why this liturgical language which is unknown to the vulgar?—For several reasons, easy to apprehend. The language of the Church which is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic must, like herself, be invariable, uniform, universal, apostolic. Without this language, intelligible to all cultivated minds, the tradition of her Fathers would be lost, the teaching of her Pontiffs and

her Doctors would become impossible, her general Councils could not assemble, nor her widely dispersed bishops understand each other; her worship would have no dignity, nor unity, nor grandeur. But if you admit the necessity, or, at least, the extreme suitableness of an *ecclesiastical* language, you must allow the preservation of it by its use in worship. It is established by experience that the necessity of speaking a language is the most pressing motive and the surest means of learning it. How many priests would remain ignorant of, or would forget the Latin tongue, if they had not to recite the Holy Office and to celebrate the Eucharistic sacrifice?

Besides, it is to God, who well understands it, that the Church speaks, in the name of all her children; and to enable them to understand her prayers and those portions of the Gospel, which she reads or chaunts, the holy Council of Trent orders, that "Pastors and all those who have the charge of souls explain frequently, but especially on Sundays and festivals, in person or by others, a part of what is read at the Mass, and among other truths, those which make the mystery of the Most Holy Sacrifice more intelligible."[1] The employing of the language of the Church, therefore, in itself so suitable, is exempt from any serious inconveniences.

Moreover, you could not require the use of the vulgar tongue for the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, without giving occasion to a multitude of dangers. It would be necessary, in the first place, to break with all the usages of the churches; for the Western Church has always spoken Latin at the altar; and the Greek, Armenian and Syriac, employed by the churches of the East, have for many centuries ceased to be the language of the people. It would next be requisite, for the same reason, for which the vernacular tongue is adopted, to employ the local dialects, the *patois* of the village, to have as many rituals as there are steeples, to change them every century, and

[1] *Sess.* xxii. c. 7.

so to make translations of our Gospels, our Rituals and our Creeds into all the jargons of the world, by which they would soon cease to be intelligible, so quickly do spoken languages change. What danger for the faith, what forgetfulness of all that is becoming, is there in such a scheme! It seems that this was understood by Luther himself, for on March 14, 1528, he wrote: "I would not have abolished the Latin Mass, to substitute for it the mass in the vulgar tongue, if I had not been forced to do it."[1]

However, so often as the celebration of Mass in the vulgar tongue presented more advantages than inconveniences, the sovereign pontiffs have authorized it. It is a question of convenience of which they are judges, a matter of discipline which depends on their authority. John VIII. permitted the Moravian priests and Paul V. the Chinese, to celebrate in their national languages.

A passage of St. Paul[2] is alleged as an objection, which however does not bear on the question. The Apostle is tracing the rules, which should regulate the employment of those supernatural gifts which at that time were common in the Church. The gift of tongues, he says, is granted by God for the conversion of unbelievers, not for the edification of believers. Let him, therefore, who speaks tongues unknown to the Christians among whom he is, abstain from haranguing them to no purpose, unless he explains himself, or some other person endowed with the gift of interpretation supplies the key to his words. The Council of Trent assuredly does not prescribe anything opposed to this sensible rule. The precept it enjoins on pastors to explain frequently what they read, is quite in conformity with, not the letter certainly, but the spirit of St. Paul's recommendation: *Qui loquitur lingua, oret ut interpretetur.*

We have explained the choice of the sacred language

[1] Memoires de Luther, tom. i, p. 130.

[2] Qui loquitur lingua, oret ut interpretetur. 1 Cor. xiv. 13

employed in our holy mysteries: let us say a word on the place in which they are celebrated. The Saviour did not chose the altar of the temple at Jerusalem for offering His unbloody sacrifice. That temple was the only one in the world, and Jesus Christ wished that "the pure oblation should be offered and sacrificed in every place."[1] That temple, a shadow and figure, was to disappear at the coming of the promised reality, it was to perish with the justly rejected Israel. Jesus Christ, therefore, chose, for instituting the new Pasch, a place of meeting, that was lofty, spacious, adorned with hangings, forming the upper story of the house, according to the usage of the Jews, called the cænacle (or Supper Room) because the family assembled there for their meals. Our churches and chapels are built on the plan of the Cænacle; we exert ourselves to make them as spacious, as richly, at least as decently adorned, as we can. The Christians, who there assemble come to seek their food, to obtain health, strength and joy. From the charity which unites them they ought to form but one family. If feasts of charity, like the agapæ of the first Christians, do not precede the celebration of the divine mysteries and the distribution of the Eucharist, it is not our fault: it is a just punishment for the abuses which St. Paul had, even in his own time, to stigmatize. Our temples, where at the baptismal font we are born to grace; where we continually receive the life of the mind and of the heart from the pulpit and the steps of the altar; where we find all the remedies, which our souls need in the bath of penitence; where the Holy Spirit is given us; where our body, severed from our soul, will come to receive the incense, the benedictions and the prayers of the Church, as pledges of its resurrection; our temples, inhabited by our Head, Jesus Christ, are by a better title than any other dwelling, our house, our refectory, our cænacle.

As they are at the same time the house of God, in

[1] Malach. i, 6.

which holiness alone ought to be found,"[1] we should never enter the Church without purifying our conscience. It is to remind us of this duty, that the ancient custom was established, which is explained and recommended by Pope Alexander I., of making on ourselves the sign of the cross immediately on entering, with water blessed by the church; and for the officiating priest, that of renewing this sprinkling in a solemn manner before celebrating the holy Mysteries. In itself this water has no virtue; but, on the one hand, it reminds us of the water and the blood which flowed from the opened side of Jesus to cleanse our souls, and which are still daily poured out on the altar, as the Church teaches us by the words she then chaunts: *Vidi aquam egredientem de templo a latere dextro, et omnes ad quos pervenit aqua ista salvi facti sunt.* "I saw water issuing forth from the temple on the right side, and all to whom that water came were saved;"[2] and, on the other hand, the prayers with which this benediction and aspersion are accompanied—prayers which ask for purification from all stain, the pardon of every fault, the driving away of all evil spirits—could not be ineffectual.

The martyrs, our brethren, have mingled their blood with the Blood of Jesus. As a recompense for their generous faith, to honor, as far as possible, their bloody sacrifice, Jesus loves to make their tombs the altars on which He immolates Himself. From the earliest ages the altars were sepulchres containing the immortal remains of a martyr or holy person. Pope Felix I. converted this custom into a law.

The altar, like the table of the Cænacle, is the representation of Calvary. In order that this may be unceasingly and vividly brought to our remembrance, a representation in relief or an image of Jesus crucified ought always to be placed over the altar.

The lamp, or the lighted taper, has at all times and in all places been the emblem of faith which enlightens, of

[1] Ps. cxii, 5. [2] Ezech. xlvii.

charity which burns, of self-devotion which spends itself. The incense, which rises towards heaven in odoriferous clouds, is an image of prayer, often used in our sacred books. These signs recall to our thoughts the feelings which ought to surround the altar of Jesus Christ; faith, prayer, charity, the spirit of self-devotion and of sacrifice.

Jesus offered Himself on the cross for the people of the West and the East, of the South and the North. This is the reason why the Priest turns his face to the East, in prayer, for thence the Sun of Righteousness rose upon us; to the West where the people are assembled, whom he greets and invites to pray with him; to the North, where he goes to read the Gospel, to exorcise, as it were, the evil spirits which are figured by the wild winds of the North; to the South, to which he turns whenever he receives from the minister of the altar the matter or the vessels of the sacrifice: for in a church properly arranged, the place appropriated to the preparations for the sacrifice, called at a later period the sacristy, is always on the south side.

A special dress and also certain ornaments, which are therefore called *insignia* (in signum) have in all times been appropriated to different functions: to sovereigns, to magistrates, to military rank, &c. The Levitical priesthood had received from the Lord the form and the color of its vestments. The ministers of Jesus Christ appear at the altar covered with the insignia of the Saviour Himself. Our *alb* is His tunic, or again, the white robe with which Herod clothed Him at the time of His sacrifice; our *chasuble*, His oriental mantle, or the purple with which He was covered in the Prætorium; our *stole*, our *maniple*, the chains with which He was laden; the cross which we bear on our shoulders is an image of His, &c. We find these ornaments in use from the first ages of the Church; their institution is attributed to Pope St. Clement.

We cannot, without departing from our plan, explain here in detail all the ceremonies of the Mass. We must

be satisfied with putting the reader on his way by some general hints.

The Gospels, as we know, relate the most important events very concisely and without any particulars. "*There they crucified Him;*" this is all that is said of the crucifixion, no mention is made of His being stripped of His garments, of the sufferings of the Victim, or of the refinement of cruelty, which fastened Him to the Cross with nails, &c., &c. . . It is in a similarly brief and simple style that St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, have related the principal facts, which, taken together, constitute the sacrifice of the Supper-room. Let us call to mind these facts so severely denuded of all their circumstances by the writers through whom they have been transmitted to us.

Jesus rises, and, girt with a linen cloth, washes the feet of His disciples, while they by the mouth of St. Peter, in vain decline it. The object of this preparatory ceremony was to represent to their senses and at the same time to produce in their consciences their purification from the slightest stains; a view which is clearly brought out by those words of Christ: "If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me. . . . You are clean, but not all."[1] The Church perfectly understood the deep meaning of these words and of those that follow: "Wash ye one another's feet," when she instituted, as the immediate preparation for the Holy Sacrifice, a general and public confession of sins, exchanged between the Celebrant and the assembled people. The Priest comes: he waits before the altar, as if fearing to go up to it, and standing on the same level as the faithful, he examines his conscience; then, bending low, he beats his breast, accuses himself as guilty before heaven and earth, "by *his own fault, his own fault, his own great fault*," and recommends himself to the prayers of his brethren. They pray for him; then, in their turn, prostrate themselves, accuse themselves, beat

[1] Joan. xiii. 8 and 11.

their breasts, ask the assistance of his intercession, and do not rise till they have received from his lips the words of forgiveness and pardon. Reassured by these encouragements given him by the Church, the priest at last goes up to the altar, and kisses it in sign of perfect reconciliation with Jesus Christ. Meanwhile the people chaunt the Introit (or Entrance), corresponding to the solemnity of the day; the priest entreats in redoubled cries for grace and mercy; and as his Saviour is about to come he thrills with hope and (on Sundays and festivals) chaunts, by order of Pope Symmachus, the Angels' Song: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace to men of good will!" This is the first part of the Mass, called the *Preparation.*

Having finished the washing of their feet, Jesus instructs and exhorts His Apostles. "Do you understand," He says, "what I have done to you? You call me Master and Lord; and you say well, for so I am. If I then, being your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; you also ought to wash one another's feet. The servant is not greater than his lord, &c."[1] In imitation of our Saviour, the priest, immediately after taking his place at the altar, opens for the benefit of the people all the sources of religious instruction, which the Lord has intrusted to His Church. He reads some portions of the Scripture, of which the selection, made by order of Pope Damasus I., is attributed to St. Jerome. First he reads a passage from the letters of the Apostles, or from the old Testament, which is called the *Epistle;* then a portion of the new Testament, called the Gospel, during which, by order of Pope Anastasius, all the faithful stand; afterwards, on solemn days, the summary of the faith expressed in the Creed of Constantinople is said; and frequently, especially on Sundays and holidays, the priest explains to the people one of the passages of Scripture which he has read, according to the order of the Council of Trent. Such is the second part of the Mass, called the *Instruction.* Formerly,

[1] Joan. xiii. 12, *and following verses.*

as soon as it was finished, the deacon dismissed the catechumens. They were not considered worthy to be present at the rest of the holy mysteries.

After having exhorted His disciples to perform the humble services of kindness and charity, Jesus received from them some unleavened bread, the only kind allowed to be eaten during the Paschal feast, and some wine, which, we learn from tradition, He mixed with a little water in the chalice. This is the third part of the sacrifice, called the *Offertory.* The priest receives from the congregation the bread wafers to be consecrated, (according to the order of Alexander I. they ought to be without leaven,) then the wine, which (conformably to the order of the same Pope) he mixes with water, after the example of Jesus Christ: and then offers the gifts which he has received to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, praying the Holy Trinity to change them, by the virtue of the cross, into better gifts.

The following, according to scripture and tradition, are the ceremonies employed and the words uttered by Jesus Christ, during the fourth and principal part of His sacrifice, called the *Consecration.* Jesus first offers a solemn thanksgiving, then he takes the bread and afterwards the cup into His holy and adorable hands, He lifts up His eyes to heaven, He blesses the gifts, and changes them into His body and blood by the words: "This is My Body! This is My Blood!" The *Canon*, or rule of consecration, preserves these ceremonies and these words, while adding to them a sublime commentary. The hymn which we call the *Preface*—"It is truly meet and just, right and acceptable to salvation, that we should always and in all places, give thanks to Thee, O Holy Lord!" &c., this hymn, to which Pope Damascus added some variations, and which, by order of Sixtus I., is concluded by the hymn of glory that Isaiah heard thrice repeated by the Angels, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts!" is but the thanksgiving of Jesus Christ repeated by the

Church . . . Then the priest, having united his intention with that of the most gracious Father who has given us His Son, of the Catholic Church and its visible head on earth, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, of the Bishop who presides over the diocese, of those for whom the sacrifice is offered, and of all the persons present; having put himself into communion with the glorious Mary ever Virgin, with the Apostles and principal Martyrs, having called to mind the ends of the sacrifice, and prayed Almighty God to effect the change of the gifts . . . . he takes the unleavened bread and afterwards the chalice into his hands, raises his eyes to heaven, blesses and consecrates them, repeating what was said by the Incarnate Word; "This is My Body! This is My Blood!" At the same time he adores, and presents to the adoration of the people the present Emmanuel. He then offers this pure, holy, spotless Victim, this sacred bread of life immortal, this cup of everlasting salvation, to the God who accepted the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech, entreating Him that this adorable Victim may be taken by the hand of His Angel to His altar on high, into the presence of His divine majesty for the salvation, the consolation and the triumph of the Church, militant, suffering, and already crowned in heaven: "By Him," he says, raising towards the Most High the Lamb without blemish, "with Him, and in Him, is to Thee, God the Father Almighty, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory, for ever and ever!"

"Take, eat, . . . drink ye all;" and, "they all drank of it." Such is the concise narration of the fifth part of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the *Communion*. Jesus invites all His apostles, they all respond to His appeal. Pope Anacletus also wished that all the faithful present at the Holy Sacrifice should participate in it by Communion, and such was the general practice in the age of St. Justin. The Church at the present day still invites all her children;

but how many are deaf to her voice! In order to prepare himself and the people for communion, the celebrant repeats in the name of all, the Prayer which our Lord Himself has taught us. Then he begs for himself, and according to the order of Leo II., he gives to all, peace, while, following the institution of Pope Sergius, the clergy and people suppliantly implore the Lamb of God, that takes away the sins of the world. Lastly, the priest receives and distributes to the communicants the divine Author of peace, accompanying the distribution with the beautiful words; "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life!" We have already shown that a participation in the chalice is neither necessary nor suitable.

The good Father of the family, who had said to His children after the multiplication of the loaves: "Gather up the fragments that remain, that they be not lost,"[1] must have the same rule of wise economy observed after the distribution of the bread of life and the cup of salvation; to neglect this, under such circumstances, would have given occasion to many profanations, like those which were severely punished by St. Pius I. Thanks should also be offered, now more than ever, for the infinite gift, which the guests at the holy Table have just received. The Gospel tells us that they who were assembled in the cænacle did not separate, until they had said or sung a hymn of thanksgiving.[2] In conformity to this example the sixth and last part of the Mass is devoted to cleansing the vessels of the sacrifice and to *returning thanks* to the Lord; and as Jesus Christ parted from His Church on the day of His Ascension in the act of giving His benediction, so the priest dismisses the congregation with a blessing.

The first fourteen verses of the Gospel of St. John are a summary statement of the faith, a complete refutation

[1] Colligite quæ superaverunt fragmenta ne pereant. *Joan.* vi, 12.
[2] Hymno dicto, abierunt in montem Oliveti. *Matth.* xxvi, 30.

of all heresies, an epitome of the whole evangelical teaching. They are reverenced and employed in the Church as a summary of the entire Gospel. The practice has been introduced of concluding the Holy Mysteries by reading this passage, just as Jesus, after the sacrifice of the cænacle, uttered that magnificent abridgement of the Gospel which is called, the *Discourse after the Supper.*

Certain parts of the Mass, especially the *Collect*, or prayer which brings together all the desires of the Church, the Preface, the Lord's Prayer, are chaunted on solemn days, in the way of recitative, in a tone of the purest and sweetest melody; other parts are said in a low voice, as were almost all the prayers of Jesus Christ upon the Cross.

Thus our Eucharistic Sacrifice is not only in substance and reality the very sacrifice of the cænacle, made present on our altars by the most admirable of miracles; it is in its very form and principal ceremonies, the faithful reproduction of the Supper of the Lord. Thus has the Church obeyed the precept of her Spouse: "Do this, which I have done, in commemoration of Me."

Some minds too ready to criticize have alleged as an objection, that there is more than one altar in each church. It is nevertheless certain that, from the first ages, the tomb of each martyr became an altar, and that there were often several altars in the same church. The Vatican Basilica, that of St. Paul on the Ostian way, the ancient church of the Holy Sepulchre, built by Constantine, each contained several altars. St. Ambrose, St. Paulinus of Nola, St. Peter Chrysologus, St. Gregory the Great, mention instances of several altars brought together within the same walls.

Others have found fault with the *flowers* and *reliquaries*, with which our altars are adorned, as if the soil of Calvary had not produced and brought into bloom the flowers of all the virtues; as if the martyrs ought not to be grouped around the Pattern and the Chief of martyrs,

carrying on upon the altar the sacrifice of Calvary. Besides, these practices are authorized by the practice of the first ages, by the Roman Pontifical, &c.

"The life of Christ," Mgr. Gerbet remarks,[1] "offers us throughout types of the pomp of Catholic worship. At His birth, a heavenly harmony was heard around His cradle; here we have the sacred type of the ardor with which the Church invites the genius of music to install itself in the temple. The tapers which have been blessed, the lamps, the brilliant candelabra are a mystical imaging of the great light which shone around the crib of the Saviour. The gold and the frankincense, which were offered by the Magi, the Church offers still in her rich ornaments and her thousand thuribles. The magnificent vestments, which on grand solemnities are given to the Priest, the representative of God, are typified in that robe of glory with which Jesus Christ enveloped Himself at His transfiguration; for the Priest is, in an eminent sense, man regenerated in Christ, man whose transfiguration begins even among the shades of earth. If, in her processions, the Church scatters flowers and unrolls carpets on the road where the Holy Sacrament is to pass, has not this practice been prefigured by the triumphant entry of the Saviour into Jerusalem, by the eagerness of the crowds to spread their garments in the way, and to throw flowery branches before the peaceful King of Sion? Thus, from age to age, the christian arts are an imitation or a prolonging of the honors with which the Word made flesh was surrounded during His sojourn upon earth, and a figure of those gifts which shall be accorded to our flesh when its eternal transfiguration is accomplished."

Let us here conclude our visit to the august Sacrament of our altars. Without doubt, during this rapid view the lamp of the Sanctuary will have poured some precious gleams into our understanding: but there is need of a grace yet more precious for our heart. In order to be

[1] Université catholique, cinquième leçon, p. 421.

entirely subdued, it needs an intimate communication of that love, which a holy communion pours in torrents into our souls. What light can supply the place of this consuming fire! What doctor could teach the wonders and the blessings of the Eucharist, like Jesus present in us and diffused through our whole being, "dwelling in us while we dwell in Him, giving us eternal life, and forming us to live by and for Him, as He lives by and for the Father . . . ?" Must it not be said of this mystery above all: "Taste and see how sweet is the Lord!"[1]

To neglect responding to the invitation of Jesus who calls us to His Table, whether that neglect proceed from indifference or from being too much occupied by the interests and pleasures of this life, would, surely be an inexcusable and most fatal fault. This we may learn from Jesus Himself:[2]

"A certain man made a great supper and invited many." "It was," says St. Matthew,[3] "a king who celebrated the marriage of his son."

"And he sent his servants at the hour of supper to say to those who were invited, that they should come, for now all things were ready.

"And they began all at once to make excuses. The first said to him, I have bought a farm and must needs go and see it: I pray thee, hold me excused.

"And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to try them: I pray thee, hold me excused.

"And another said, I have married a wife and therefore I cannot come.

"And the servant returning told these things to his lord. Then the master of the house being angry, said to his servant: Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor and the feeble and the blind and the lame.

[1] See the development of this thought and pressing motives for responding to this invitation in the work of M. Martinet, entitled: *Emmanuel.*

[2] Luc. xiv. 6. [3] Matth. xxii. 2.

"And the servant said: Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room.

"And the lord said to the servant: go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.

"But I say unto you that none of those men, who were invited, shall taste of my supper."

We will not outrage the love of the Good Master of the house by so obstinate a refusal of his gifts. We will not yield our place to a crowd less privileged than we are by preventing grace. We will not bring on ourselves the terrible excommunication, which sentences to an eternal exclusion from the Eucharistic, and thereby from the heavenly feast.

It were better to profit by the example of Elias. This great prophet, when persecuted by Jezabel and threatened with death by that impious queen, was wandering in the desert, alone and in deep discouragement. He went a day's journey, and then sat down under a juniper tree and requested that he might die, saying to the Lord, "Take away my life; for I am no better than my fathers!"[1] From the effects of weariness, mental distress and want of food, he fell asleep. Then the Angel of the Lord comes to him, wakens him, and touching him gently, says: Arise and eat! Elias opens his eyes and sees upon the sand near his head a hearth-cake and a vessel full of water; he then eats and drinks, and yet soon falls again into utter prostration and slumber. The angel comes to him a second times, awakens the servant of God, and gives him to eat and drink. "Arise, eat," he says again, "for thou hast yet a great way to go." Elias then arose and ate, and afterwards was so strengthened by this miraculous food that he was able to walk on for forty days and forty nights, till he came to Horeb, where the Lord had revealed Himself to the patriarchs.

This traveller across the desert, pursued by death, and

[1] III Reg. xix. 5.

suffering from so many distresses and so many necessities, is our poor human nature; and the Angel of the Lord who gives us what is better than a hearth-cake, better than the water of the cistern or the brook, is Jesus, the Son of the Lord, offering us His own flesh to eat and His own blood to drink. I beseech you, accept this divine refection, not once only, but as often as you feel your strength failing, as often as the Church, the dispenser of God's gifts, orders or advises you. Thus shall we be able to walk on with courage and constancy to the end of our pilgrimage, till we arrive at the heavenly mountain where God shows Himself unveiled and gives Himself to His elect.

VII.

The errors and variations of Protestants on the dogma of the Eucharist.

In order to come to that blessed end, let us forsake at once those *lecture-rooms* which heresy calls *temples*, and those pulpits condemned to sound forth nothing but contradiction, error, calumny, instead of the word of God.

On the 22nd of August, 1524, in the Black Bear, at Jena, a priest and a monk, amid copious libations, engaged in a most animated theological dispute. The priest was an archdeacon and professor of theology at Wittenberg; he was called Carlstadt. He had given lectures and the doctor's cap to a young Augustinian monk, already become famous, named Luther. That day, in the pulpit, Luther had been so far carried away by his vehemence, as to utter an invective against his old master, whom he apostrophized and treated as seditious. In revenge, Carlstadt now threatened his rebellious pupil, that he would write against him, and in opposition to the real presence —a doctrine to which Luther was strongly attached. Luther defied him, and laid a bet that he would never do it. The stake was a gold florin; Carlstadt put it in his pocket: the champions shook hands, drank to each other's

health, and separated, addressing one another in all friendship with these evangelical wishes: "I hope to see you broken on the wheel!" "I hope you may break your neck before you are out of the town!"[1]

Carlstadt at once applied himself to the work. From the principle laid down by Luther, that nothing was to be believed, which was not found in Scripture, he concluded that neither the sacrament of the Eucharist nor the sacrifice of the Mass ought to be admitted, since no one of these words was to be found in the New Testament. Luther's only answer was to treat him as *an assassin of souls*, and to have him banished. Carlstadt, finding a refuge with Zuinglius, the former cure of Einsiedlen and Zurich, continued to contend against the doctrine of the Eucharist, and maintained that the words, "This is my body," ought to be explained thus: This flesh, which I show you enveloped in my tunic, this breast, this face, these feet, these hands, all this, is my body. Yes, indeed, my body .... is my body![2]

Zuinglius had to seek for a better explanation, for the only use of Carlstadt's was to elicit others. One night, when he was asleep, he had a dream in which he imagined that he was disputing about the dogma of the Real Presence with the registrar of the town, a zealous defender of the Catholic doctrine; "then," says he, "I suddenly saw a fantastic personage appear; whether he was black or white I do not remember: (*Monitor ille ater an albus fuerit non memini*); who said to me: Coward, why don't you answer that it is written in Exodus: "The Lamb is the Pasch," which means: the Lamb signifies the Pasch?"

Taught by this unknown commentator on Scripture, Zuinglius thenceforward translated the words, "This is my body," by, this signifies my body.[3]

Œcolampadius arrived at the same result by a different

[1] Luther, *Epist. ad Argentinenses.*
[2] Zwingle, *De ver. et fals. religione.* Hospinian, part. ii. f. 132.
[3] Hospinian, part. ii, f. 25 and 26.

process. He consented to translate *est* by, is, but he explained, "*my body*" by "*the figure of my body.*" On which his opponents objected that if the devil succeeded in making the world believe that *body* ought to be taken only for "*the sign of the body,*" we should soon see strange things come to pass. Thenceforth Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, and Carlstadt, with the addition of Bucer and Capiton, who followed the Reformed of Strasburg, became the chief leaders among the enemies of the sacrament, called *Sacramentarians.*

Luther, in an address to these Reformed at Strasburg, avows that he would willingly have denied the Real Presence and dealt that last blow on the Pope, but that the doctrine seemed to him so established in the holy Scriptures as to be unassailable.[1] He therefore was content with explaining it in a way of his own. He had, or he pretended to have had, a vision, calculated to strike the minds of the simple. He wrote the account of it himself in 1535, and had it translated into Latin by Justus Jonas.[2] The being, who appeared to him towards midnight, and roused him from sleep to dispute with him, was Satan, yes, Satan in person. Luther describes his words, his arguments, the tone of his voice, the terrible impression, which the dispute made both on his body and his mind. He maintains that, succumbing under such attacks, Emser and Œcolampadius, had been found dead in their beds. Satan reproached him with the private masses which he had celebrated almost every day for fifteen years, as being a detestable idolatry. These masses, he told him, were null and sacriligious, for want of power and faith in him who celebrated them, and because he had not followed the form instituted by Christ, &c. . Luther attempted some timid answers, then, his heart palpitating with fear, and his body drenched in a cold sweat, he

[1] *Epist. ad Argent.*

[2] See in the German edition of Luther's works, t. vi. his treatise, *Fur die Winkelmesse,* that is to say, The Mass said in a Corner.

yielded to his adversary's arguments, and from that day forward ceased to go up to the altar. He completed his system of the Eucharist according to the conclusions of his infernal antagonist: He taught that the body of Jesus Christ, being inseparable from His divinity, exists, like His divinity, in every place; that it is given us in, under, and with the bread; that, nevertheless, the mass is not a sacrifice; that the priest cannot, without being guilty of a crime, either communicate alone or refuse to administer both species to the communicants. According to Luther, these words of Jesus Christ, "Eat ye all of this, for this is my body," have the ridiculous meaning: "Eat ye all this bread, for with this bread is my body, which, however, is everywhere, and consequently is already in your breast, in your throat, on your tongues! By conceding to Bucer that the body of Jesus Christ is not permanently in the Eucharist, Luther seems to attribute only an intermittent *ubiquity*, and consequently only an intermittent divinity to the Saviour. . However, he did not cling firmly to his system; he changed it frequently. Whether it were transubstantiation or consubstantiation, seemed to him a matter of indifference. Following Melancthon, he allowed the first to certain churches; if definitely he adopted the idea of the simultaneous presence of the bread and the body of Christ, it was, according to his own statement in his letter to Henry VIII, because the papists wished to oblige him to renounce it.

Osiander desired to go further than Luther. He taught that in the Eucharist, Christ united Himself personally to the bread, and that, consequently it might be said after the consecration, "This bread is God."[1]

Schwenkfeld imagined that the words of Jesus Christ must be read backwards, and therefore be translated; My body is really bread or food. Luther called him a devil incarnate, and devoted him and all his followers to hell.

The Confession of Augsburg hesitated long: it drew its

[1] Melancthon, lib. ii. *Epist.* 447.

tenth article on the Eucharist in five or six different ways, one of which is perfectly catholic, and speaks only of the *species* of bread and wine, under which the body and blood of Jesus Christ are given us; three others express simply and plainly *consubstantiation*, or the simultaneous presence of bread and the Saviour's body; and one is completely silent as to the bread and wine, and is content with saying that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly given to those who eat at the supper (the edition of 1540 says *are represented*, to attract the Calvinists). Notwithstanding these tergiversations, which show to what sacrifices they resigned themselves in order to unite all parties, the sacramentarians refused to subscribe to this strange confession of faith.[1]

Calvin attempted to reconcile, by a new system, the *real absence* of Zuinglius and the *real presence* of Luther. He admits with the former that the body of Jesus Christ is not really in the Eucharist, and that those words; "This is my body," come to the same thing as, This is not my body. He proves very well the absurdity of Luther's system, which ascribes to the body of the Saviour the immensity which is an attribute of God alone. He concludes that that sacred body is in heaven and no where else. But he maintains that the true believer, reminded by the presence of the bread and wine, and by the history of the supper, believes in the existence of the person of Christ, and that by this faith he really feeds on it, the Holy Spirit by His ineffable power, being able to bring together things most widely separated.[2] From this explanation it follows, that they who are without faith can have no share in this mysterious eating, of which the indispensable instrument is faith, and that an unworthy communion is impossible. According to Calvin, those words of Jesus Christ: "Eat ye all of this, for this is my body," signify, In taking this, eat my body really, for this is only the figure of it.

Melancthon, always undecided, seemed to pass from the

[1] Bossuet, Variat. l. iii.

[2] *Instit.* l. iv. c. 17

side of Luther to that of Calvin. In the edition of the Confession of Augsburg, which he drew up in 1540, he omitted the formula of condemnation directed against the Calvinists. He said that at the supper the body and blood of Christ were truly represented, words which Calvin would have subscribed. At a later period he admitted the presence of Jesus Christ at the very moment of the use of the sacrament only, and rather in the communicant than in the bread.

The Anglican church remained long attached by tradition to the dogma of the Real Presence. She does not, however, admit in her confession of faith, Catholic transubstantiation, or Lutheran consubstantiation, or the figurative presence of the Calvinists. She communicates kneeling, though under Charles II. she was forbidden to adore the Eucharist; she believes that Jesus Christ is present, and discourages inquiries as to the manner of His presence.

The Anabaptists made the Eucharist a symbol of fraternity, as do some of our modern Socialists.

The Socinians saw in it nothing more than a setting forth of the benefits which we owe to the death of Jesus Christ![1]

Finally, the Rationalists have descended to such low and trivial views of the august mystery of the Eucharist, that one of their school, whom we have already named,[2] proposes to adopt as their formula in the celebration of the supper these beautiful words: "Drink a little wine; the virtue is not in the wine, it is in yourselves, in the doctrine of God and in God." According then to this doctor, the words of Jesus Christ: "This is my blood, drink ye all of it," mean; Drink ye all of this cup, for . . it is full of wine.

Thirty years after the first explosion of the Reformation, there appeared a book, in which two hundred different interpretations were already enumerated of these fou

[1] *Cat. Racov.* [2] Doctor Lange.

words: "This is my body." Even in the time of Bellarmine it was no longer possible to count the interpretations of these words. And what progress has Protestant requirement made between Bellarmine's time and our own? At the present day every one has a system of his own, and every system is good, provided that "This is my body," is made to mean, This is not my body. Since 1817, owing especially to an edict of his Prussian Majesty, William III., the Calvinists, who believe that at the supper they eat a piece of bread, communicate at the same table with the Lutherans, who believe that they receive there the body of the Son of God. At the period of this singular union, adopted in Prussia and in a great part of Germany, the Calvinist doctrine was established as the basis: and it was agreed, that the supper was not only the sign, but the pledge and means of our spiritual com munication with the person of Christ.

Such a union had been proposed by Bucer to the founder of Lutheranism himself. It is interesting to know what he thought of it; he shall tell us himself. When Brentius came to speak to him on the subject: "Cursed be any such alliance," exclaimed Luther, "be it cursed even to the lowest depth of hell! It would not merely destroy Christianity, it would insult, after the devil's own fashion, the tears and sufferings of Christendom. Suppose I cut the throat of the father and mother, the wife and child of my friend, and then wishing to cut his throat, too, I say to him: 'Let us be at peace, my friend, we love each other still; what has happened is not worth the pain of our ceasing to be friends!' What would he say of it? Thus it is that these fanatics murder Christ, my master, and God my father, and the Church my mother, and christians my brothers; and then say to me; Peace!" . . . Then reasoning with more calmness, he concludes thus: "*We* say, that according to the word of Christ, His body and His blood are in the sacrament. If we are deceived in our doctrine, we are false to God, we

say and we preach what he has neither said nor preached; we are liars, seducers, traitors, blasphemers. Our adversaries, on the contrary, maintain, that there is nothing but bread and wine in the supper. If they are deceived in their belief and their teaching, then it is they who blaspheme God, who give the lie to the Holy Ghost, who betray Christ and deceive the world. ONE OF THE TWO SIDES MUST OF NECESSITY BE THE DEVIL'S SIDE, there is no medium. Let each christian ask himself whether that is a question of little importance."[1]

Notwithstanding the gravity of the question and the incompatibility of these contrary opinions, the "cursed alliance" has been brought about, and the devil who, according to Luther, only inspired one of the two sides, is now master of them both. The Lutherans at any rate must admit this, since the Calvinist doctrine has been made the basis of the union.

"Can anything be conceived more strange," says M. de Maistre on this subject, "than the union of these two religions without any preliminary explanation?

"Had the Calvinist, before his act of union, publicly embraced the doctrine of the Real Presence, or had the Lutheran renounced this same doctrine?

"If these two religious systems were identical in essence, why were they separated, and why did the self-styled Evangelicals vomit forth as many insults against the Sacramentarians as against Catholics?

"But if, on the contrary, there are substantial differences contained in the profession of faith of the two religions, how is it that they are uniting at this day without a new profession of faith? After a separation of three centuries it is certainly not the time to come and tell the world that their differences are nothing; and even if they were, the contrary opinion, which is that of a pretty considerable portion of the human race, would be sufficient to con-

[1] Cited by Hænighaus in *la Réforme contre la Reforme*, c. vii.

demn, I do not say the piety, but the bare honesty of a union so extraordinary.

"Certainly, if the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches proposed to unite with us, they would cause us the greatest joy; but what cautious preliminaries should we not adopt before proceeding to this happy union? We should require the most unequivocal renunciations of the errors of the sixteenth century, and professions of faith equally solemn and explicit in regard to our distinctive dogmas."

M. de Maistre concludes that this union is not the result of religious indifference alone, but of a secret scheme which by this means is preparing for the return of the dissidents to the Church, their mother. "To unite the Protestants among themselves," he says, "in order the more easily to unite them to us, is by no means a chimerical project. It is undeniable that the first union would be infinitely favorable for the second; as it would be incomparably more easy, in treating of such an affair, to have only a single power at the head, instead of several, who would dispute among themselves as much as with us ... And is it then impossible that a number of good minds should have conceived the happy thought of profiting by the opportunity in order to pave the way for the future invaluable union which would heal the great wound of the sixteenth century, give a religion to those who now have none, and greatly add to our perfection in our own? We accept this augury, at the same time that we recognize the finger of God, rather than the hand of man, in these inexplicable events, which are unconsciously working together for the restoration of unity."

The Oxford school perceptibly approaches to it. (See Tracts for the Times, 34, 38, 90.) According to Dr. Pusey, the Catholic dogma which affirms trans-substantiation and the Anglican Articles which deny it, only differ in the meaning attached to the word *substance*.

VIII.

THIRTEENTH SESSION.

(The Third under Pope Julius III.)

HELD OCTOBER 11, 1551.

Decree concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same Legate and Nuncios of the Apostolic See presiding therein,—although the end for which It assembled, not without the special guidance and governance of the Holy Ghost, was, that It might set forth the true and ancient doctrine touching faith and the sacraments, and might apply a remedy to all the heresies, and the other most grievous troubles with which the Church of God is now miserably agitated, and rent into many and various parts; yet, even from the outset, this especially has been the object of Its desires, that It might *pluck up* by the roots those tares of execrable errors and schisms, with which *the enemy* hath, in these our calamitous times oversown the doctrine of the faith, in the use and worship of the sacred and holy Eucharist, which our Saviour, notwithstanding, left in His Church as a symbol of that unity and charity, with which He would fain have all Christians be mutually joined and united together. Wherefore, this sacred and holy Synod delivering here, on this venerable and divine sacrament of the Eucharist, that sound and genuine doctrine, which the Catholic Church,—instructed by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and by His Apostles, and taught by the Holy Ghost, who day by day *brings to her mind all truth*,[1] has always retained, and will preserve *even to the end of the world*, forbids all the faithful of Christ, to presume to believe, teach or preach henceforth concerning the holy Eucharist, otherwise than as is explained and defined in this present decree.

CHAPTER I.

On the real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist.

In the first place, the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that in the august[2] sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and

[1] Joan. xiv. 26; xvi. 13. [2] Almo.

substantially contained under the species of these sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant,—that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God: for thus all our forefathers, as many as were in the true Church of Christ, who have treated of this most holy Sacrament, have most openly professed, that our Redeemer instituted this so admirable a sacrament at the last supper, when, after the blessing of the bread and wine, He testified, in express and clear words, that He gave them His own very Body, and His own Blood; words which,—recorded by the holy Evangelists, and afterwards repeated by St. Paul, whereas they carry with them that proper and most manifest meaning in which they were understood by the Fathers,—it is indeed a crime the most unworthy that they should be wrested, by certain contentious and wicked men, to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which as *the pillar and ground of truth*, has detested, as satanical, these inventions devised by impious men; she recognizing, with a mind ever grateful and unforgetting, this most excellent benefit of Christ.

CHAPTER II.

On the reason of the Institution of this most holy Sacrament.

Wherefore, our Saviour, when about to depart out of this world to the Father, instituted this Sacrament, in which He poured forth as it were the riches of His divine love towards man, *making a remembrance of His wonderful works*;[1] and He commanded us, in the participation thereof, to venerate His *memory*, and *to show forth His death until He come*[2] to judge the world. And He would also that this sacrament should be received as the spiritual food of souls, whereby may be fed and strengthened those who live with His life who said, *He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me*;[3] and as an antidote, whereby we may be freed from daily faults, and be preserved from mortal sins. He would, furthermore, have it be a pledge of our glory to come, and everlasting happiness, and thus be a symbol of that one body whereof He is the head, and to which

[1] Ps. cx. 4. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [3] Joan. vi. 58.

He would fain have us as members be united by the closest bond of faith, hope, and charity, *that we might all speak the same things, and there might be no schisms amongst us.*"[1]

CHAPTER III.

On the excellency of the most holy Eucharist over the rest of the Sacraments.

The most holy Eucharist has indeed this in common with the rest of the sacraments, that it is a symbol of a sacred thing, and is a visible form of an invisible grace; but there is found in the Eucharist this excellent and peculiar thing, that the other sacraments have then first the power of sanctifying when one uses them, whereas in the Eucharist, before being used, there is the Author Himself of sanctity. For the Apostles had not as yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when nevertheless He Himself affirmed with truth that to be His own body which He presented (to them). And this faith has ever been in the Church of God, that, immediately after the consecration, the veritable Body of our Lord, and His veritable Blood, together with His soul and divinity, are under the species of bread and wine; but the Body indeed under the species of bread, and the Blood under the species of wine, by the force of the words; but the body under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under both,[2] by the force of that natural connection and concomitancy whereby the parts of Christ our Lord, *who hath now risen from the dead, to die no more*,[3] are united together; and the divinity, further more, on account of the admirable hypostatical union thereof with His body and soul. Wherefore it is most true, that as much is contained under either species as under both; for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and under any part whatsoever of that species; likewise the whole (Christ) is under he species of wine, and under the parts thereof.

CHAPTER IV.

On Transubstantiation.

And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the

[1] 1 Cor. i. 10.
[2] Sub utraque, under each.
[3] 1 Cor. vi. 9.

consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made[1] of the whole substance of the bread into the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood; which conversion is by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.

CHAPTER V.

On the worship and veneration to be shown to this most holy Sacrament.

Wherefore, there is no room left for doubt, that all the faithful of Christ may,[2] according to the custom ever received in the Catholic Church, render in veneration the worship of latria, which is due to the true God, to this most holy sacrament. For not therefore is it the less to be adored on this account, that it was instituted by Christ, the Lord, in order to be received: for we believe that same God to be present therein, of whom the eternal Father, when introducing Him into the world, says: *And let all the angels of God adore Him;*[3] whom the Magi, *falling down, adored;*[4] who, in fine, as the Scripture testifies, was adored by the Apostles in Galilee.

The holy Synod declares, moreover, that very piously and religiously was this custom introduced into the Church, that this sublime and venerable sacrament be, with special veneration and solemnity, celebrated, every year, on a certain day, and that a festival; and that it be borne reverently and with honor in processions through the streets and public places. For it is most just that there be certain appointed holy days, whereon all Christians may, with a special and unusual demonstration, testify that their minds are grateful and thankful[5] to their common Lord and Redeemer for so ineffable and truly divine a benefit, whereby the victory and triumph of His death are represented. And so indeed did it behoove victorious truth to celebrate a triumph over falsehood and heresy, that thus her adversaries, at the sight of so much splendor, and in the midst of so great joy of the universal Church, may either *pine away*[6] weakened and broken, or, touched with shame and confounded, at length repent.

[1] Conversionem fieri.
[2] Do exhibit, or render, quin exhibeant.
[3] Ps. cxvi. 7.
[4] Matth. ii. 11.
[5] Memores, unforgetful.
[6] Ps. cxi. 10.

CHAPTER VI.

On reserving the Sacrament of the sacred Eucharist, and bearing it to the sick.

The custom of reserving the holy Eucharist in the sacrarium[1] is so ancient, that even the age of the Council of Nice[2] recognized that usage. Moreover, as to carrying the sacred Eucharist itself to the sick, and carefully reserving it for this purpose in churches, besides that it is exceedingly conformable to equity and reason, it is also found enjoined in numerous Councils,[3] and is a very ancient observance of the Catholic Church. Wherefore, this holy Synod ordains, that this salutary and necessary custom is to be by all means retained.

CHAPTER VII.

On the preparation to be given that one may worthily receive the sacred Eucharist.

If it is unbeseeming for any one to approach to any of the sacred functions, unless he approach holily; assuredly, the more the holiness and divinity of this heavenly sacrament are understood by a Christian, the more diligently ought he to give heed that he approach not to receive it but with great reverence and holiness, especially as we read in the Apostle those words full of terror: *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.*[4] Wherefore, he who would communicate, ought to recall to mind the precept of the Apostle: *Let a man prove himself.*[5] Now ecclesiastical usage declares that necessary proof to be, that no one, conscious to himself of mortal sin, how contrite soever he may seem to himself, ought to approach to the sacred Eucharist, without previous sacramental confession. This the holy Synod hath decreed is to be invariably observed by all Christians, even by those priests on whom it may be incumbent by their office to celebrate, provided the opportunity of a confessor do not fail them; but if, in an urgent necessity, a priest should celebrate without previous confession, let him confess as soon as possible.[6]

[1] In sacrario, sacred place or vessel.
[2] Nicoen. 1, c. 13.
[3] Concil. Rhem. c. 2, 10, Labbe T. v. p. 1693; Concil. Later. sub. Innoc. III. c. 26; Concil. Ancyr. c. 6; Concil. Agathens. c. 15.
[4] 1 Cor. xi, 29. [5] V. 28. [6] Quamprimim.

CHAPTER VIII.

On the use of this admirable Sacrament.

Now as to the use of this holy sacrament, our Fathers,[1] have rightly and wisely distinguished three ways of receiving it. For they have taught that some receive it sacramentally only, to wit sinners: others spiritually only, those to wit, who eating in desire that heavenly bread which is set before them, are, by a lively *faith which worketh by charity*,[2] made sensible of the fruit and usefulness thereof: whereas the third (class) receive it both sacramentally and spiritually, and these are they who so *prove* and prepare themselves beforehand, as to approach to this divine table *clothed with the wedding garment*.[3] Now as to the reception of the sacrament, it was always the custom in the Church of God, that laymen should receive the communion from priests; but that priests, when celebrating should communicate themselves; which custom, as coming down from apostolical tradition, ought with justice and reason to be retained. And finally this holy Synod with true fatherly affection admonishes, exhorts, begs, and beseeches, through the bowels of the mercy of our God, that all and each of those who bear the Christian name would now at legth agree and be of one mind in this sign of unity, in this bond of charity, in this symbol of concord; and that, mindful of the great majesty, and the exceeding love of our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave His own precious life as the price of our salvation, and gave us His own flesh to eat, they would believe and venerate these sacred mysteries of His body and blood with such constancy and firmness of faith, with such devotion of soul, with such piety and worship, as to be able frequently to receive that super-substantial bread, that it may be to them truly the life of the soul, and the perpetual health of their mind; that being invigorated by the strength thereof, they may, after the journeying of this miserable pilgrimage, be able to arrive at their heavenly country, there to eat, without any veil, that same bread of angels, which they now eat under the sacred veils.

But forasmuch as it is not enough to declare the truth, if errors be not laid bare and repudiated, it hath seemed good to the holy Synod to subjoin these canons, that all,—the Catholic doctrine being already recognized,—may now also understand, what are the heresies which they ought to guard against and avoid.

[1] St. August. c. Donat. sæpe ; St. Prosper in lib. Sentent.
[2] Gal. v. 6. [3] Matth. xxii. 11, 12.

CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST

CANON I.—If any one denieth, that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith, that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or by his virtue; let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one denieth, that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated;[1] let him be anathema.

CANON IV.—If any one saith, that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that, in the hosts, or consecrated particles, which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true Body of the Lord remaineth not; let him be anathema.

CANON V.—If any one saith, either that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or, that other effects do not result therefrom; let him be anathema.

CANON VI.—If any one saith, that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external of latria; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church; or, is not to be proposed[2] publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters; let him be anathema.

CANON VII. If any one saith, that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the sacrarium,[3] but that, immediately after consecration, it must necessarily be distributed

[1] Separatione facta, when a separation has been made.
[2] Proponendum, set before, exposed.
[3] In sacrario.

amongst those present; or, that it is not lawful that it be carried with honor to the sick; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII. If any one saith, that Christ, given[1] in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema.

CANON IX. If any one denieth, that all and each of Christ's faithful of both sexes are bound, when they have attained to years of discretion, to communicate every year, at least at Easter, in accordance with the precept of holy Mother Church; let him be anathema.

CANON X. If any one saith, that it is not lawful for the celebrating priest to communicate himself; let him be anathema.

CANON XI. If any one saith, that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; let him be anathema. And for fear lest so great a sacrament may be received unworthily, and so unto death and condemnation, this holy Synod ordains and declares, that sacramental confession, when a confession may be had,[2] is of necessity to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burthened with mortal sin, how contrite even soever they may think themselves. But if any one shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately to assert, or even in public disputation to defend the contrary, he shall be thereupon[3] excommunicated.

SESSION THE TWENTY-FIRST.

(The fifth under Pope Pius IV.)

HELD JULY 11, 1562.

The sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, —lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same Legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein,—whereas, touching the tremendous and most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are in divers places, by the most wicked artifices of the devil, spread abroad certain monstrous errors, by reason of which, in some provinces, many are seen to have departed from the faith and obedience of the Catholic Church, It has thought fit, that what relates to communion under both species, and the communion of infants, be in this place set forth. Wherefore It forbids all the faithful of Christ, to presume henceforth to believe, teach, or preach otherwise on these matters, than is in these decrees explained and defined.

[1] Exhibitum, presented.
[2] Habita copia confessoris.
[3] Eo ipso, by that very act.

CHAPTER I.

That laymen, and clerics when not sacrificing, are not bound, of divine right, to communion under both species.

Wherefore, this holy Synod,—instructed by the Holy *Spirit*, who is *the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of godliness*,[1] and following the judgment[2] and usage of the Church itself,—declares and teaches, that laymen, and clerics when not consecrating,[3] are not obliged, by any divine precept, to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist, under both species; and that neither can it by any means be doubted, without injury to faith,[4] that communion under either species, is sufficient for them unto salvation. For, although Christ, the Lord, in the last supper, instituted and delivered to the Apostles, this venerable sacrament in the species of bread and wine; not therefore do that institution and delivery tend thereunto, that all the faithful of the Church be bound, by the institution[5] of the Lord, to receive both species. But neither is it rightly gathered, from that discourse which is in the sixth of John,—however according to the various interpretations of holy Fathers and Doctors it be understood,—that the communion of both species was enjoined by the Lord: for He who said: *Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you* (v. 54); also said: *He that eateth this bread shall live for ever* (v. 59); and He who said: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life* (v. 55), also said, *The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world* (v. 52), and, in fine, He who said: *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him* (v. 57), said, nevertheless: *He that eateth this bread shall live for ever* (v. 59).

CHAPTER II.

The power of the Church as regards the dispensation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

It furthermore declares, that this power has ever been in the Church, that, in the dispensation of the sacraments, their substance being untouched,[6] it may ordain, or change, what things soever it may judge most expedient, for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said sacraments, according to the difference of circumstances, times and places. And this

[1] Is. xi. 2. [2] Concil. Constantiense. [3] Non conficientes.
[4] Salva fide. [5] Statuto, appointment.
[6] Salva illorum substantia.

the Apostle seems not obscurely to have intimated, when he says: *Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.*[1] And indeed it is sufficiently manifest that he himself exercised this power, as in many other things, so in regard of this very sacrament; when, after having ordained certain things touching the use thereof, he says: *The rest I will set in order when I come.*[2] Wherefore, holy Mother Church, knowing this her authority in the administration of the sacraments, although the use of both species has, from the beginning of the Christian religion, not been unfrequent, yet, in progress of time, that custom having been already very widely changed, she, induced by weighty and just reasons, has approved of this custom of communicating under one[3] species,[4] and decreed that it was to be held as a law; which it is not lawful to reprobate, or to change at pleasure, without the authority of the Church itself.

CHAPTER III.

That Christ whole and entire, and a true Sacrament are received under either species.

It moreover declares, that although, as hath been already said, our Redeemer, in that last supper, instituted and delivered to the Apostles, this sacrament in two species, yet it is to be acknowledged, that Christ whole and entire and a true sacrament are received under either species alone; and that therefore, as regards the fruit thereof, they, who receive one species alone, are not defrauded of any grace necessary to salvation.

CHAPTER IV.

That little Children are not bound to sacramental Communion.

Finally, this same holy Synod teaches, that little children, who have not attained to the use of reason, are not by any necessity obliged to the sacramental communion of the Eucharist; forasmuch as, having been regenerated by the laver of baptism, and being incorporated with Christ, they cannot at that age, lose the grace, which they have already acquired of being the children of God. Nor therefore, however, is antiquity to be condemned, if, in some places, it, at one time, observed that custom; for as those most holy Fathers had a probable[5] cause for what they did in respect of their times, so, assuredly, is it to be be-

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 1 [2] 1 Cor. xi. 34. [3] Altera.
[4] Concil. Constantiense, Sess. 13. [5] Probabilem.

lieved without controversy, that they did this without any necessity thereof unto salvation.[1]

Canons on Communion under both species, and on the Communion of Infants.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that, by the precept of God, or by necessity of salvation,[2] all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both species of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that the holy Catholic Church was not induced, by just causes and reasons, to communicate, under the species of bread only, laymen, and also clerics when not consecrating; let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one denieth, that Christ whole and entire —the fountain and author of all graces—is received under the one species of bread; because that—as some falsely assert—He is not received, according to the institution of Christ himself, under both species; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one saith, that the communion of the Eucharist is necessary for little children, before they have arrived at years of discretion; let him be anathema.

SESSION THE TWENTY-SECOND.

(The sixth under Pope Pius IV.)

HELD SEPTEMBER 17, 1562.

Doctrine on the sacrifice of the mass.

The sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, —lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same Legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein—to the end that the ancient, complete, and in every part perfect faith and doctrine touching the great mystery of the Eucharist may be retained in the Holy Catholic Church; and may, all errors and heresies being repelled, be preserved in its own purity; (the Synod) instructed by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, teaches, declares, and decrees what follows, to be preached to the faithful, on the subject of the Eucharist, considered as being a true and singular[3] sacrifice.

[1] Eos nulla salutis necessitate id fecisse.
[2] Necessitate salutis, as necessary for salvation.
[3] Singularis.

CHAPTER I.

On the institution of the most holy sacrifice of the Mass.

For as much as, under the former Testament, according to the testimony of the Apostle Paul, there was no *perfection, because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood;*[1] there was need, God, the Father of mercies, so ordaining, that *another priest should rise, according to the order of Melchisedech,*[2] our Lord Jesus Christ, who might consummate, and lead to what is perfect, as many as were to be sanctified. He, therefore, our God and Lord, though He was about to offer Himself once on the altar of the cross unto God the Father, *by means of His death,*[3] there to operate *an eternal redemption;*[4] nevertheless, because that His priesthood was not to be extinguished by His death, in the last supper, on the night in which He was betrayed,—that He might leave, to His own beloved Spouse the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice, once to be accomplished on the cross, might be represented, and the memory thereof remain even unto the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit,—declaring Himself constituted *a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech,*[5] He offered up to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine; and under the symbols of those same things, He delivered (His own body and blood) to be received by His Apostles, whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament; and by those words, *Do this in commemoration of me,*[6] He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood, to offer (them;) even as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught. For, having celebrated the ancient Passover, which the multitude of the children of Israel immolated in memory of their going out of Egypt, He instituted the new Passover, (to wit) Himself to be immolated, under visible signs, by the Church through (the ministry of) priests, in memory of His own passage from this world unto the Father, when by the effusion of His own blood He redeemed us, and *delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into His kingdom.*[7] And this is indeed that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness, or malice of those that offer (it;) which the Lord foretold by Malachias was to be *offered in every place, clean to his name, which was to be great amongst the Gentiles;*[8] and which the Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians, has not

[1] Hebr. vii. 11, 18.
[2] V. 11.
[3] Hebr. ix. 5.
[4] V. 12.
[5] Ps. cix. 4.
[6] Luc. xxii. 19.
[7] Coloss. i. 13.
[8] Malach. i. 11.

obscurely indicated, when he says, that they who are defiled by *the participation of the table of devils, cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord*;[1] by *the table*, meaning in both places the altar. This, in fine, is that oblation, which was prefigured by various types of sacrifices, during the period of nature, and of the law; inasmuch as it comprises all the good things signified by those sacrifices, as being the consummation and perfection of them all.

CHAPTER II.

That the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory both for the living and the dead.

And for as much as, in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross; the holy Synod teaches, that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy, and find grace *in seasonable aid*,[2] if we draw nigh unto God, contrite and penitent, with a sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence. For the Lord, appeased by the oblation thereof, and granting the grace and gift of penitence, forgives even heinous crimes and sins. For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different. The fruits indeed of which oblation, of that bloody one to wit, are received most plentifully through this unbloody one; so far is this (latter) from derogating in any way from that (former oblation.) Wherefore, not only for the sins, punishments,[3] satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified,[4] is it rightly offered, agreeably to a tradition of the Apostles.

CHAPTER III.

On Masses in honor of the Saints.

And although the Church has been accustomed at times to celebrate certain masses in honor and memory of the saints; not therefore, however, doth she teach that sacrifice is offered unto them, but unto God alone, who crowned them; whence neither is the priest wont to say, "I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter, or Paul;"[5] but, giving thanks to God for their victories, he implores

[1] 1 Cor. x. 21. [2] Hebr. iv. 6. [3] Pœnis, pains.
[4] Purgatis, purged. [5] S. August. De Civ. Dei, l. viii. c. 27.

their patronage, that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate upon earth.

CHAPTER IV.

On the Canon of the Mass.

And whereas it beseemeth, that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and of all things this sacrifice is the most holy; to the end that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, the Catholic Church, instituted, many years ago, the sacred Canon, so pure from every error, that nothing is contained therein which does not in the highest degree savor of a certain holiness and piety, and raise up unto God the minds of those that offer. For it is composed, out of the very words of the Lord, the traditions of the Apostles, and the pious institutions also of holy pontiffs.

CHAPTER V.

On the solemn ceremonies of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

And whereas such is the nature of man, that, without external helps, he cannot easily be raised to the meditation of divine things; therefore has holy Mother Church instituted certain rites, to wit, that certain things be pronounced in the mass in a low, and others in a louder tone. She has likewise employed ceremonies, such as mystic benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of this kind, derived from an apostolical discipline and tradition, whereby both the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be recommended, and the minds of the faithful be excited, by those visible signs of religion and piety, to the contemplation of those most sublime things which are hidden in this sacrifice.

CHAPTER VI.

On Mass wherein the priest alone communicates.

The sacred and holy Synod would fain indeed desire that, at each mass, the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but also by the sacramental participation of the Eucharist, that thereby a more abundant fruit might be derived to them from this most holy sacrifice; but not therefore, if this be not always done, does It condemn, as private and unlawful, but approves of and therefore commends, those masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally; since those masses also ought to be considered as truly common; partly because the people communicate spiritually thereat; partly also because they are celebrated by a public minister of the

Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful, who belong to the body of Christ.

CHAPTER VII.

On the water that is to be mixed with the wine to be offered in the chalice.

The holy Synod notices, in the next place, that it has been enjoined by the Church on priests, to mix water with the wine that is to be offered in the chalice;[1] as well because it is believed that Christ the Lord did this, as also because from *His side there came out blood and water;*[2] the memory of which mystery is renewed by this commixture; and, whereas, in the apocalypse of blessed John, *the peoples* are called *waters,*[3] the union of that faithful people with Christ their head is hereby represented

CHAPTER VIII.

On not celebrating the Mass everywhere in the vulgar tongue; the mysteries of the Mass to be explained to the people.

Although the Mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, nevertheless, it has not seemed expedient to the Fathers, that it should be everywhere[4] celebrated in the vulgar tongue. Wherefore, the ancient usage of each church, and the rite approved of by the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, being in each place retained; and, that the sheep of Christ may not suffer hunger, *nor the little ones ask for bread, and there be none to break it unto them,*[5] the holy Synod charges pastors, and all who have the cure of souls, that they frequently, during the celebration of mass, expound either by themselves, or others, some portion of those things which are read at mass, and that, amongst the rest, they explain some mystery of this most holy sacrifice, especially on the Lord's day and festivals.

CHAPTER IX.

Preliminary Remark on the following Canons.

And because that many errors are at this time disseminated and many things are taught and maintained by divers persons, in opposition to this ancient faith, which is based on the sacred Gospel, the traditions of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the holy Fathers; the sacred and holy Synod, after many and grave

[1] Synod. Quini. Sext. cap. 32; Conc. Carthag. iii. c. 24; Conc. Flor.
[2] Joan. xix. 34. [3] Apoc. xvii. 15. [4] Passim, indiscriminately.
[5] Lam. iv. 4.

deliberations, maturely had, touching these matters, has resolved, with the unanimous consent of all the Fathers, to condemn, and to eliminate from holy Church, by means of the canons subjoined, whatsoever is opposed to this most pure faith and sacred doctrine.

Canons on the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that by those words, *Do this for the commemoration of me.* (Luke xxii. 19.) Christ did not institute the Apostles priests; or, did not ordain that they, and other priests should offer His own body and blood; let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits him only who receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one saith, that, by the sacrifice of the mass, a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the cross; or, that it is thereby derogated from; let him be anathema.

Canon V.—If any one saith, that it is an imposture to celebrate masses in honor of the saints, and for obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends; let him be anathema.

Canon VI.—If any one saith, that the canon of the mass contains errors, and is therefore to be abrogated; let him be anathema.

Canon VII.—If any one saith, that the ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs, which the Catholic Church makes use of in the celebration of masses, are incentives to impiety, rather than offices of piety; let him be anathema.

Canon VIII.—If any one saith, that masses, wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally, are unlawful, and are, therefore, to be abrogated; let him be anathema.

Canon IX.—If any one saith, that the rite of the Roman Church, according to which a part of the canon and the words of consecration are pronounced in a low tone, is to be condemned; or, that the mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only; or, that water ought not to be mixed with the wine that is offered in the chalice, for that it is contrary to the institution of Christ; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

FOURTEENTH SESSION.

I.

Institution of the Sacrament of Penance found in Scripture and Tradition.

Of all the questions which have a rightful claim to the interest of mankind, assuredly the most important is this: By what means can a Christian obtain and be assured of the pardon of those sins, which he has committed since his baptism?

It is plainly necessary that the true religion should afford satisfaction to this urgent and legitimate need of a soul which seeks to be reconciled to God. Accordingly when we have said in our Creed, "I believe the holy Church," we immediately add, "I believe the forgiveness of sins."

Sin is a disorder which exists in the heart, and it cannot be remitted, so long as it is not disavowed, that is, acknowledged with sorrow and self-accusation.

But to whom ought this indispensable disavowal to be addressed? Undoubtedly to the authority which has been wounded by the sin. It is to God, therefore, that it should be addressed in the first place; it is to God that it should be addressed always, since He is the supreme legislator and the eternal subsisting law. It is to the feet of the Sovereign Judge, then, that we shall go to pour forth with tears the prayer of the publican: God, be merciful to me a sinner! And though we choose the priest for our confidant and our judge, we shall still say, when we kneel

before his tribunal, *Confiteor Deo :* I confess to almighty God!"

But further, without dispossessing Himself of His authority, God in fact communicates the exercise of it, in different degrees, to parents in the family, to magistrates in the state, to His ministers in the religious society ; and at the same time makes over to them in a determinate, but not an equal measure, the right of requiring and receiving the acknowledgement of repentence.

It is in virtue of this right that a father, a mother, a tutor require that a child, or pupil, should acknowledge the falsehood he has told, the sweetmeats stolen, the china broken. Such humble confession of the fault committed is always required as the condition of pardon ; so long as the child refuses it, his mother herself is severe ; when he has made his confession, and that a really sincere one, she at once gives him the kiss of peace.

It is in virtue of this delegated authority that the magistrate orders an inquiry, receives depositions, submits the accused to interrogatories.* The law requires that his legitimate questions should be answered by the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The spontaneous and regretful acknowledgment of the guilty party is an extenuating circumstance, which obtains, if not acquittal, at least a milder punishment.

In the religious society it is necessary to acknowledge a still higher right: a supernatural communication of authority, made, though not in equal measure, to the Levitical ministry of old, and now to the Christian priesthood. According to the law of Moses, if a man or woman had transgressed the commandments of the Lord, from negligence, he or she was to confess the sin which had been committed.[1]

According to the book of Leviticus, he who had com-

* That is according to the law in France.

[1] Vir sive mulier, cum fecerint ex omnibus peccatis quæ solent hominibus accidere, et per negligentiam transgressi fuerint præceptum Domini, atque deliquerint, confitebuntur peccatum suum. *Num.* v. 6.

mitted certain faults ought to acknowledge them, the Hebrews say,[1] that a priest, having determined the sacrifice to be offered, might pray for the penitent and for his sin.

Galatinus, Bellarmine, Bartolocci, and others affirm that this confession ought to specify, under the obligation of secrecy, however, the sin committed.

Besides this, on the tenth day of the seventh month, the high priest, having purified his whole body, and clothed himself in simple linen, like the other priests, and having then offered two victims in sacrifice for the sins of the priests and especially for his own, extended his hands over the head of a living goat offered to God, and "confessed over him the sins of the people."[2]

Confession, then, secret and individual as well as public and general, was in use among the Jews. Father Morin cites passages from the Talmud, which recommend individual confession to the dying: "for all true believers" (it says) "observe this practice." The better instructed Jews, observes St. Antoninus, make a point of confessing all their sins, before death, to some descendant of the tribe of Levi, when they are so fortunate as to find one.[3]

These practices explain certain proverbs which were current among the Hebrew people, and have found a place in our sacred books. "He that shall confess his sins and forsake them shall obtain mercy."[4] For the salvation of thy soul be not ashamed to say the truth. For there is a shame that bringeth sin, and there is a shame that bringeth glory and grace."[5] "Be not ashamed to confess thy sins, but submit not thyself to every man for sin;" and speaking of what is due to priests; "for thy negligences purify thyself with a few, give glory (that is, confess) before death, so shalt thou give thanks and praise God, and glory in His mercies."[6]

[1] Cum peccaverit in uno ex his confitebitur aperte peccatum quod peccavit super eo. *Levit.* v. 5. Bellarmine's translation.

[2] Levit. xv. 26. [3] Cited by Bellarmine, *De Pœnit*, c. iii. n. 23.

[4] Prov. xxviii, 13. [5] Eccli. iv. 24, 25.

[6] Eccli. iv. 31; vii. 34, and xvii. 26, 27.

We also see why, at times of public calamities, the Jews had recourse to the confession of their sins, in order to appease the divine justice: *They stood and confessed their sins;*[1] why when John the Baptist appeared on the banks of the Jordan, preaching, and baptizing with the Baptism of penance, no one was astonished at hearing him require and receive from repenting sinners the avowal of their crimes: *They were baptised in the Jordan, confessing their sins,* says the Gospel.[2]

But the sinner who accuses himself does not merely offer satisfaction to the law which he has violated; he also obeys a need of his own heart. "Every sentiment which affects us vividly," says Mœhler, "seeks some outward expression." When the heart is broken by repentance, this deep sorrow wishes to reveal itself in open day. Then we confess our sins to the priest, to the Church itself. When two persons who have been at enmity sincerely desire to be reconciled, they feel impelled to acknowledge the wrong they have done, and it is only by such an avowal that they can arrive at a genuine reconciliation."[3]

We are not then surprised to find a sort of confession even among the heathen themselves, both the ancients and those of our own times.

Among other instances we may mention the Greeks and Romans on their initiation into the sacred mysteries, (imitated in this point by Weishaupt in his *Code illuminè*), the Chinese, the Japanese, the inhabitants of Thibet, Siam, and the Island of Ceylon,[4] and in the new world the penitents of Mexico and Peru.[5] The form of absolution employed by the Peruvian priests is remarkable: breaking a string in presence of the sinner, who has just accused himself of his faults, they say: "I break, by the power which God has given me, the chain of thy sins, just as I

[1] 2 Esdr. iv. 2. [2] Matth. iii. 6. [3] Symbol, l. i. § 33.

[4] See Le Dogme de la confession, venge des attaques de l'hérésie et de l'incrédulité, by the abbe Guillois, letter 3.

[5] Annales de philosophie chrétienne, t. xxii. p. 146.

break this string." The Esquimaux, on certain occasions, assemble to fast and offer sacrifices to the Gods of the rivers, the woods and the air. If one of them is struck by any accident, he goes to the magician, confesses all his sins to him, and asks him to enjoin him a penance. This confession is in all cases made aloud, and the penance, however rigorous it may be, must always be punctually performed.[1]

This universal practice of confession proves that the institution, before it was raised by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament, had been imposed on the people of God by the law of Moses, and transmitted by tradition to other nations.

But behold the Saviour of mankind appears, He whom they called the "friend of publicans and sinners;" He who said "I am not come to call the just, but sinners . . . They that are in health need not a physician, but they that are ill." He who compares Himself to a father, pressing a prodigal child to his bosom; to a good shepherd going to seek the stray sheep; to a poor woman, searching with so much anxiety for the piece of money she had lost, and having so much joy in finding it; He who Himself willed to absolve the paralytic, Mary Magdalen, Zacheus. . . of whom they said, "Who is this, that forgiveth sins also?"

Let us see what is the remedy that He will leave for the cure of the maladies, into which we may fall after Baptism. It is this: In giving the Apostles their mission, Jesus said to them; I appoint you ministers of the reconciliation to be wrought between God my Father and sinners: "As my Father sent me so send I you;" in virtue of the omnipotence which has been given me on earth and in heaven, I give to you the right of binding and loosing consciences, of judicially remitting and retaining sins; I

[1] Letter of Father Lavellochère, Annales de la Prop. de la Foi. May, 1851.

bind myself to ratify in heaven the sentence which you shall pronounce on earth.

But it is a blessing to have the exact text of the words which prepared and completed this divine institution. According to St. Matthew, Jesus said first to Peter; "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."[1] Afterwards He addressed precisely the same words to the twelve Apostles.[2]

According to St. John, Jesus after His resurrection appeared in the cænacle, in the midst of His assembled disciples, and after the words, "Peace be with you," said; "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you;" and breathing on them, He continued: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained."[3]

But how can a judge remit or retain sins aright? The greatest authority would not be sufficient; there must be prudence and knowledge also to direct the exercise of authority. It is necessary, therefore, that he obtain an exact knowledge, first, of the number, the gravity, and the quality of the offences committed, next, and most especially, of the repentance of the guilty person, of his firm resolutions, of his desire to give satisfaction both to God and man. And how can this knowledge be obtained except by confession!

Accordingly we see in Scripture the first christians go to accuse themselves at the feet of the Apostles. Of the Ephesians "that believed," and had consequently received Baptism, "many" says St. Luke,[4] affrighted at the chastisement, inflicted on some who had used the name of Jesus profanely, "came confessing and declaring their deeds; (not their miracles, as Luther childishly says, but their sins, their offences, as the Syriac translates, and as the context requires), "and many of those who had follow-

[1] Matth. xvi. 19.
[2] Matth. xviii. 18.
[3] Joan. xx. 22, and 23.
[4] Act. xix. 18.

ed curious arts brought together their books and burned them before all."

We also hear the great Apostle testifying to the Corinthians that God, "after having reconciled the world to Himself in Christ, has given us the ministry of reconciliation (to fulfil); for God," he proceeds, "was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing to them their sins, and He hath placed in us the word of reconciliation. For Christ then we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ's sake, we beseech you, be reconciled to God."[1] Was it possible for St. Paul to explain better the whole economy of the sacrament of Penance? Through the Saviour's mediation God allows sinners to regain His favor; therefore a ministry of reconciliation is established in the Church, and the Apostle, made as it were the plenipotentiary of Christ, speaks in His name, and unceasingly says to sinners; Come, come, be restored to the grace of God!

St. James, again, recommends this confession of sins to be made by one to another, that is to say, by the faithful to their pastors, by the pastors to each other.[2]

Let us here observe, that according to these texts, the sins which the Apostles do *not remit, are retained;* the consciences which they do not *loose* on earth, remain *bound* in heaven. In order to lead sinners to return to the favor of God by the mediation of Jesus Christ, a ministry of reconciliation has been established, and it belongs to this ministry, to speak the word which reconciles, and to open the heavenly kingdom, the keys of which have been given to it. Therefore, it is not optional with us to recur or not to these ministers of pardon; we *must* do so in order to be pardoned. It is a necessity as imperative as that which urges us to have our consciences unloosed, to obtain the remission of our sins, and to be admitted into heaven.

It is in this sense that all the Fathers have explained

[1] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. [2] Jacob v. 16.

the intention of Jesus Christ in instituting the sacrament of Penance. Gibbon (in his History of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire) tells us, that confession was one of the principal points in the belief of the popish Church during the first four centuries. And it is easy to prove that the centuries following the fourth have not been in contradiction to those that preceded them.

Assuming that the sacrament of Penance, as administered by the Church and acknowledged by the council, was really instituted by Jesus Christ, the following are the facts which ought to appear, and of which without doubt ecclesiastical history will afford evidence: The Fathers will assert that priests *alone* can absolve the sinner from his sins duly confessed; that free, complete, sorrowful confession ought to supply the prudence of the priest with the means of measuring the public and secret penance to be imposed: that he who conceals his sins or accuses himself without repentance makes his pardon useless, and deserves to see his wickedness inscribed before the eyes of the whole world, etc. Rules, or *canons*, will be drawn up for confessors, in order to assist them in proportioning the punishment to the offence; in seasons of fervor, it will be necessary to moderate the austerities of penitents, and to take care that public confessions may not occasion discredit or scandal to any one; when that fervor has relaxed, the Councils will have to prescribe to the spiritually sick the remedy which is indispensable to their cure. We shall know the names of the confessors who have given the aid of their ministry to persons celebrated in history. Lastly, the sects which separated from the Church of Jesus Christ in the early ages will probably, many of them at least, have retained some traces of this salutary institution.

Now such are exactly the results, which we obtain by examining the antiquities of the Church. The Armenians, the Jacobites, the Copts, the Nestorians, the Ethiopians, in a word, all the Eastern sects, which have been

separated from the Church of Rome since the fifth and sixth centuries, practise confession as necessary. This fact is not disputed.

The practice of the faithful prostrating themselves before the knees of the priests in making the confession of their sins, had given rise, says Baronius, to certain calumnies which were current among the heathens at the beginning of the third century.

Eusebius relates that Marcus Julius Philippius, the successor of Gordian in the Empire, in the year 244, had to confess his sins before being admitted to pray with the faithful on Easter Eve. The names have been preserved of the confessors of Thierry I., of Pepin, of Charles Martel, of Pepin the Short, of Louis the Mild, and of his son Lothaire. Charlemagne ordered that with each prefect or colonel in his armies, there should be a confessor for the soldiers. They confessed before engaging in battle, before undertaking any dangerous journey, in any great perils, before approaching the holy Table, before receiving confirmation, during Lent, in preparation for great solemnities, and above all, in order to dispose themselves for a good death.[1]

St. Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa in Africa, who was called the Augustine of his age, wrote thus at the beginning of the sixth century: "You tell us that our daughter, your wife, was lately ill, almost to the last extremity, and that, as is most generally done, she received the imposition of hands, and did penance, according to the usages of the christian religion."

Before this date Victor Vitensis tells us of the lamentations and cries of the inhabitants of Africa. Deprived of their bishops and priests who were exiled in the persecution of Hunneric, they said: "Who will baptize our little ones, in the fountains of everlasting life? Who will lay hands on us in our penance, and release us, when

[1] Guillois, Letter 6.

bound with the chains of sin by the forgiveness of reconciliation: for it is to you that it is said, 'Whatsoever ye shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.'" To these supplications Hunneric replied by afterwards sending orders to other bishops; "not to chaunt psalms, nor pray, nor carry with them any book to read, nor to baptize, nor to ordain, nor to presume to reconcile any one: *non baptizetis, non ordinetis, aut aliquem reconciliare præsumatis.*"

The Council of Laodicea (in 366), of Châlons (644), of Rheims (639), of Nantes (656), of Constantinople (692), the first Council of Germany (735), the third of Tours (813), the sixth of Paris (829), the Council of Pavia (850), etc., proclaimed the divine institution and the necessity of confession many centuries before the Council of Lateran.[1]

Penitential canons of great severity had been drawn up in the fourth century. They determined the rigor and the duration of the penance, which public sinners ought to perform, before being reconciled to the Church and admitted to communion. They have not been rigorously observed, save in the Greek church, nor without having produced among immense advantages some inevitable evils.

Thus the confession of a lady of rank having led to a deacon's being defamed and deposed, Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, suppressed in his church, both the obligation of a public acknowledgment of sins, and the office of the penitentiary priest, who was charged with the public penitents. Each one could choose his own confessor and only accuse himself in secret. "Since it is absolutely necessary," says Sozomen, who relates this fact, "to confess our sins in order to receive the pardon of them, it was thought too onerous and too painful to require that this confession should be made in public, as

[1] Guillois, Letter 6.

in a theatre, in presence of the people and so to make one's sins known to all."[1]

As to the teaching of the Fathers, it is unanimous and express. "They insist on the power of pardoning sins," says Cheneviere,[2] who quotes St. Clement the pope, Origen, St. Cyprian, St. John Chrysostom. He might have added Tertullian, who says that confession, which the Lord has appointed, is necessary;[3] St. Irenæus, who shows that it was practised;[4] Lactantius;[5] St. Basil, who expresses himself thus: "It is necessary to confess our sins to those who have been entrusted with the dispensing of God's mysteries;"[6] St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem,[7] St. Gregory Nazianzen,[8] St. Ambrose,[9] of whom St. Paulinus says that he received his penitents with so great charity "that he made them weep with him, and only revealed to God the sins, which they had confessed;" St. Augustine, who refutes those that believe it is sufficient to confess to God alone.[10] St. John Chrysostom, whom M. Cheneviere allows to be on our side, explains himself very clearly on the necessity of confession, in his twentieth homily on Genesis. In his thirty-third homily on St. John, he is no less explicit, exhorting his brethren to confess their sins, if they do not wish that, on that terrible day, they should be revealed to the whole world. In his treatise on the Priesthood, he teaches that the priest is the person to whom each one ought to confess his sins. Consequently, when he says, in his thirty-first homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "we ought not to make a public display of ourselves, nor

[1] In the seventh book of his history, c. 16, M. Cheneviere, in alluding to this circumstance, says with imperturbable coolness: "In 390, private confession was abolished, on account of the disorders in point of morals which had resulted from it. This is a fact which it is important to notice."

[2] Dogmatiq. p. 411 and 414 note. [3] De Pænit. c. 9. 10.
[4] Adv. Hær. l. i. c. 13. [5] Inst. l. iv. c. 17. [6] Reg. 288.
[7] Catech. i and ii. [8] Oral. xvi. 17. [9] De Pænit. l. ii. c. 3.
[10] Hom. 392 (al. 49) n. 3; 351 (al. 50) n. 9.

accuse ourselves before others," he only means to dissuade the faithful from public confession, which, as we have remarked was exposed to certain evils. So Gratian and all the commentators explain it.

Some theologians may have differed in opinion on this question: Is the receiving of the sacrament of Penance so necessary to the sinner, that he cannot in any case be reconciled to God without it? The Council of Trent has resolved it in the decree on Justification (ch. xiv.) Let us then conclude with the Council: *"The fathers have, with unanimous consent, ever recognized the institution of the Sacrament of Penance in the words of our Lord."* Sess. xiv. c. 1.

II.

Benefits of this divine Institution.

But was it not sufficient to make an analysis of this medicine, and to consider its numberless advantages, in order to establish with certainty that it is a divine institution?

Sin has insinuated itself into our hearts through carelessness, through ignorance or forgetfulness of the divine law; this sacrament demands as its first, its preliminary condition, reflection, and consideration of ourselves and of the divine law. Sin has turned the heart away from God to attach it to the creature; *contrition*, the first part of penance, ought to break that heart, in order to detach it from the creature, and to bring it back to God. Sin has most frequently been brought out into external manifestation by words or acts insulting to the law of God in general, and to such or such a divine law in particular: *Confession*, made at the feet of a minister of Jesus Christ, in a posture of humiliation, disavows every action opposed to the supreme law, while in acknowledging the kind of fault committed, it makes amends to the particular law which had been violated. Sin had sought, perhaps it had procured, some criminal enjoyment; *satisfaction*, or the penance imposed ought to be opposed to this enjoyment

and proportioned to it, and of a medicinal character. Lastly, sin, by attacking the infinite majesty, has derived from this aggression an infinite amount of wickedness, which transcends all the satisfaction, that a mere creature could offer; the sacrament, on the other hand, derives from the infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ, all that in which we are deficient towards satisfying for ourselves, all that we need for the entire acquitting of our debt.

Such is the analysis of this divine remedy, which combats all the different elements of sin, by principles opposed to them. If, on the other hand, we consider the sacrament of Penance as a judicial act, we ought to distinguish with Mgr. Gerbet, the examination, the accusation, the judgment, the punishment.[1] "Here the examiner is the guilty party himself, assisted by repentance and hope. The accuser, again, is himself. The same individual accuses and is accused; owing to that mysterious resolution of man's two-fold nature, the pure will disengages itself from the corrupt will, that had previously enfolded it like a serpent in its tortuous coils, but which now is struck dead and falls off. The judge is the disciple of Jesus Christ, who has received from Him the power of remitting sins, at the same time that the divine breathing has inspired into him the spirit of gentleness and charity. In judging, he proceeds in the very opposite way to human judges. They press the charge, while the culprit excuses himself; at the tribunal of souls, the more the culprit accuses himself, the more does the judge in charity seek out such excuses as truth allows; and if he pronounces a sentence, it is always a sentence of mercy, for the suffering, which attends it, is itself merciful and healing: privations for the senses to deaden the too powerful attraction of pleasure, alms to destroy avaricious selfishness, prayers to humble man by the sense of his weakness and to cure the inflation of his pride.

"And all men who have been regenerated by Jesus

[1] Université Catholique, tom. ii. p. 7.

Christ, are admitted to participate in this civilization of conscience. All ages, all ranks, all distinctions are confounded in the common level of humility and restoration. The king kneels at that tribunal; the beggar is raised up there; the child, that has scarcely attained the use of reason, learns to stammer out the words which purify the soul; and when the last sighs of the dying are transformed into humble acknowledgments, the laden breast presses less heavily on his lightened soul. Often on one side of that humble throne, where the minister of God is seated, a great criminal is preparing to tear asunder the veil of the long night of a life of guilt, while innocence, on the other side, ignorant of its innocence, reveals it while believing that it accuses itself."

The advantages of this divine institution are incalculable. It gives us an adviser in our doubts, a teacher in our ignorance, a guide in all our ways, a support in all our moments of weakness, a comforter in our affliction, a physician in all our spiritual sicknesses, one who defends us against the powers of hell, and, when death arrives, introduces us to heaven.

By this means we are accompanied, from infancy even to our latest day, by a witness, whose eyes ought to see and his ears to hear all, who will have to penetrate all the folds and doublings of our heart, whose advice accompanies us, whose reproaches or encouragements await us, whose care is promised us, whose inviolable fidelity is secured for ever.

So powerful, so salutary, is this law of christian penitence, that it can supply the place of all other laws, procure their observance, prevent, repair and punish the infraction of them.

How great power for preventing sin is possessed by that man of God, to whom you lay open your inclinations, your temptations, the circumstances, which determine your position, and even the antecedents of your life!—And for curing it, what means does he not possess, who

calls down from heaven the grace that purifies and that which preserves from sin, who can feed you, as often as he thinks it good for you, with the food of the strong; who by his exhortations, his injunctions, his counsels, the penance he imposes, leads you to repair the injustice, you have done, to reconcile yourselves with your enemies, to remove dangerous occasions, to take all the precautions which may ensure your perseverance.

"Religion," says Manzoni,[1] "would have her ministers of reconciliation pure, in order that the holiness of their lives may increase the confidence placed in their words, and that the sinner who approaches them may feel that he has returned into the society of virtuous men; but she would also have them humble, in order that they may be pure, and that the guilty person may have recourse to them without fear of being repulsed. He feels no repugnance in approaching one, who acknowledges that he is himself a sinner; one who even out of the sinner's avowal of his faults elicits that confidence, which is so pleasing to God; who venerates in one who 'comes to himself' the grace of God calling sinners to Him; who regards him as the sheep, which the Good Shepherd is carrying on His shoulders, and sees in the penitent kneeling at his feet the object of the joy of heaven; who touches his wounds with compassion and respect, and sees them already covered with that Blood, which he is about to invoke for their healing."

And with what gentleness is this power of the confessor exercised! When you approach that tribunal which gives back innocence to the repenting, custom requires you to say: "*My Father!*—It is not to a judge that you are going; it is to a father.—And what do you seek, my son?—*Bless me!*—I bless you; but on what ground do you ask my blessing?—*Because I have sinned!* . . . . This opening gives the tone to the whole dialogue. It is the penitent who himself has chosen, out of all the approved

[1] Observations sur la morale catholique, c. viii. § 3.

priests in the whole world, his judge, or rather his father. —It is he who accuses himself, aggravates or extenuates his faults and is always believed on his word. It is he who, by his trustfulness and docility, gives his spiritual father greater or less authority, more or less decisive power of action against him, or rather on his behalf.

Our tribunals avenge violations of order committed in the face of the sun and of the world; are severe on crimes which, brought out into external act, endanger property, honor, security and life. They are the agents of a mere external civilization. But we have learned from Jesus Christ and from experience, that it is "from the heart" that proceed vicious words and actions, evil intentions and desires, "murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies."[1] So long as the heart is not regulated, directed and submitted to the law, the man is still, in the inner court (of conscience,) an immoral being, uncivilized, nay, to speak plainly, savage and barbarous, daily and a hundred times a day guilty in will of murder, robbery and adultery. He devotes himself to repressing only the external manifestations of these passions, which are punishable by the courts of law, or at least by the tribunal of public opinion. He cultivates the poisonous plant, contenting himself with concealing its fruits; he adds fuel to the fire, hoping to keep down the flame and the smoke. His public acts he keeps within the limits of what is legal; but his desires, his wishes, his projects, and such actions as are secret and secure of impunity often transgress these bounds. What power shall intervene to put his will and his acts in harmony? Who shall make this savage, who on the stage of the world plays the part of a civilized being, really chaste and humane? Who shall substitute the straightforwardness and sincerity of earnest conduct for the hypocrisy of this immoral double dealing? The sacred institution of the tribunal of consciences . . . Here is the most effectual means

[1] Matth. xv 19.

which God, the Saviour and Legislator of mankind, could establish in order to civilize souls, and to render His Gospel practicable to all.

Let us develop this thought. The work of civilizing the christian begins in the *individual*, whose personal faculties it perfects. It is followed up in the *member of the family*, whose relations it regulates. It is completed in the *citizen*, whom it prepares and leads to serve the public good in the best way.

The individual has need of convictions, especially of religious convictions, that are just, solid, well grounded, deeply impressed upon the soul. His will requires to be submitted to rules of morality, which are pure, precise, going into the details of conduct, adapted to his position and voluntarily accepted. His heart calls for peace and security in regard to God and the future; for consolations in the time of adversity, which is always near at hand. Lastly, there is need that his body be protected against the assaults of the passions, and sheltered not only from all scandalous aberrations, but from every vicious habit and all irregular liberties. Now, who does not at once perceive how well calculated the direction of the sacrament of Penance is, to procure the advantages that are of primary importance to the christian?

The teaching which is given to each one individually at the sacred tribunal is exclusively directed to the person who receives it, is within the reach of his understanding, and proportioned to his good will. It enters more deeply than any other into his heart. Nothing can be more kindly, paternal, affectionate, and sacred. The doctrinal and still more the moral teaching so given affords the solution of such cases of conscience as arise in practice, dissipates self-deception and scruples, cures prejudices, answers objections, clears up doubts ; and such is the disposition of the penitent that it is always favorably received, while the tribunal from which it emanates gives it an authority quite divine.

This direction especially regulates the will, and supplies it with the most pressing motives for doing all that is good and perfect. It restrains, directs, subdues, or at any rate moderates the passions; prevents the will from going wrong, or raises it up after its fall, curing the wounds, which it may have received. It dispels that trouble of mind, which deadens our moral energies, and calms the agitation of remorse, by which we are discouraged, paralysed, and plunged in gloom and melancholy, sometimes in despair. The sinner who has finished the confession of his faults with feelings of true repentance is at peace, and ought to be so. He feels that he is freed from an enormous burden, and what he experiences, approaches to the happiness and security of innocence.

"It is but too true," says Manzoni,[1] "that when a man falls into sin he has a tendency to continue in it; and that the loss of the testimony of a good conscience grieves without improving him. Nay, it is even a recognized fact, that, in general, the guilty heap up sins, in order to smother remorse, like those who in the confusion and terror of a fire throw upon the flames all that comes to hand, as if to extinguish them. Remorse, that feeling which religion changes into contrition by the hopes she gives, is most frequently unfruitful or productive of deadly effects without her. The criminal hears in his conscience that terrible voice, "You are no longer innocent," and that other still more terrible, "You never can be innocent again." He looks on virtue as being no longer possible for him; and his understanding tries to persuade him that he can do very well without it, that it is but an empty name; that men exalt it because they find it useful in others, or because they venerate it from prejudice. He seeks to fill his soul with vicious sentiments, in order to reassure himself, and also because virtuous sentiments are a torment to him. But, generally, they who say to themselves, that virtue is an empty name, are not really con-

[1] *Observations sur la morale catholique*, c. viii. § 3.

vinced of this. If an external voice declared to them with authority, that they could recover virtue, they would believe its reality, or rather would admit that they had always believed it. This is what religion effects for those who are willing to listen to her voice. She speaks in the name of a God, who has promised to remember no more the iniquities of the repenting sinner; she promises pardon, she pays the debt of sin. Mystery of wisdom and of mercy! Mystery which reason cannot penetrate, but which fills it with admiration: a mystery which, in the inestimable price paid for our redemption, gives us an infinite idea of the injustice of sin and of the means of expiating it, which affords us an immeasurable reason for repenting, and immeasurable grounds for confidence."

As to those sufferings of the heart which do not result from sin, what can better soothe them and lessen the weight of the cross, than those paternal words, which, accompanied by grace, seem to proceed from the very heart of Jesus Christ?—"You complain, my child, but would not your faults have deserved a trial more severe? Is it not by the path of suffering that Jesus Christ and all the saints, following His steps, have gone to heaven? . . . Is it not written: 'I afflict those whom I love?' . . . And then, what virtues of patience, humility, resignation will not affliction lead you to practise? And what an occasion for acquiring imperishable riches. Still, our good Master, that He may Himself comfort your heart, invites you to His table to-day. In order to make it light for you, He wishes to bear your cross with you. . . Go then, your sins are forgiven; the Tabernacle is open for you."

Finally, for the purpose of securing to the body that inviolable reverence which is due to it, could God Himself, in His infinite wisdom, have devised a means more effectual than the obligation imposed on those who are growing up, on young men, on all, of acting in every place and at every time under the ever-open eye not only

of their Guardian Angel, but of the genius of the holy tribunal? The looking forward to a confession, which is soon to be made, turns men aside from sin, "says Bourdaloue," with more force than even the apprehension of death and judgment; . . . and the recollection of a recent communion will, for a long time, make a fall impossible. How many pure souls owe the preservation of their innocence to this powerful influence! As to those who are already suffering from the disease of sin, we know that this remedy, administered as frequently and as wisely as it ought to be, has never failed to effect a cure.*

Even the maladies of the body often find an alleviation, and sometimes a remedy, in absolution. For if, as is frequently the case, their cause lies in some vicious habit, in some irregular passion, confession will cure the evil in its principle, which no other remedy could reach.

If the malady is caused, maintained or aggravated by that gloom, that melancholy, which is the bitter fruit of remorse or chagrin when not consoled by religion, these, the too frequent causes of languor, consumption, madness, suicide, will be removed by the sacrament, which gives peace.

If the sick man is tormented by that feverish agitation, that distressing want of sleep, those attacks of frenzy which are often excited by the fear of God's judgments, and the near approach of hell, absolution will restore calm, serenity and hope to his soul. In such feverish uncertainty, under the burden of such gloom, and in the anguish of such a struggle, what relief could any remedies bring, so long as vice continued its ravages and unsubdued passion its violence? The action of such remedies is neu-

* In his elementary manual of Geography, M. de Klæden, a Protestant Professor at Berlin,—supported by the most authentic documents which are supplied in a detailed statistical statement of scrupulous exactitude,—establishes the following propositions: *crimes and disorders of all kinds are much more numerous in Protestant than in Catholic countries. . . . In mixed countries the amount of crime is in an inverse proportion to the Catholic element.*

tralized by the principle within, that is working in an opposite direction; but as soon as that principle is extirpated as soon as all is calm, pacified and well-ordered within, the succors of art may successfully second the efforts of nature. Thus in the treatment of disease, the usefulness of confession as an auxiliary remedy is not denied even by Protestant physicians.[1]

The laws of the family are those which unite by a sacred and indissoluble bond the husband and wife, and again those which subject children to their parents, servants to their masters.

Nothing is of more essential importance than these laws, of which God is Himself the author; but then again, nothing is more difficult than to obtain their complete fulfilment. Would you proclaim from the pulpit, or in books published for the use of the faithful, all the clauses and conditions of that contract which Jesus Christ has made a sacrament for Christians? No, assuredly, this is impossible. And yet, if you suppose those laws unknown or broken, you see the sanctity of this alliance violated, of this alliance whereof the Incarnation is the model, and

[1] In a treatise on the value of confession in a medical point of view, published by a Protestant physician at Geneva, we find the following acknowledgment: "How many persons are suffering, simply because they are not able to make a confession of their faults to a minister of peace! . . . There are no diseases more obstinate than those which are connected with moral disorders. . . . Confession, therefore, as an auxiliary remedy would be more useful than is generally supposed. . . . Many morbid affections need the advice of a venerated counsellor, much more than the presence of a physician," (p. 16). In support of his personal observations the author quotes a remark of the celebrated Tissot. He was attending a young lady who was reduced to a most alarming condition; in the prospect of approaching death she abandoned herself to the most violent agitation and to transports of despair. Tissot caused religious assistance to be given her. Immediately after receiving the viaticum and extreme unction, she became calm, and occupied herself with God; the fever diminished, and in a few days the illness had disappeared; and the Protestant doctor could not refrain from exclaiming in admiration, "How great is the power of confession among Catholics!"

the family brought down by a multitude of abuses and excesses from the heights of christian civilization to brutality and barbarism. *Marriage honorable,* says the Apostle, *and the bed undefiled*![1] This you will never obtain except by the discreet and wise direction of the sacrament of Penance. Human laws are silent, the pulpit is of necessity mute, conscience is often uncertain, perplexed, and most desirous of being deceived: the minister of God will preserve a soul that is honest and sincere from all self-deception.

It is not sufficient that the bond be pure and sacred, it must also be inviolable. It is possible that impatience, disgust, natural antipathies, difference of tastes and tempers may render the yoke burdensome, that desires for separation may be allowed to enter the heart, and that persons may be surprised into thinking of that outrage against the family, called a *divorce*: an outrage which robs christian love of all its charms, the family of all its securities, the weaker sex of the protection which it needs against the stronger, children of the assurance that they shall receive an education from those who have given them birth. This monstrosity has become a common practice, legalized and reputed perfectly orthodox by all Protestant sects, wherever the doctrine of sacramental Penance has been subjected to reformation. The Church has preserved the Catholic family from it. But what means does she possess for making endurable the burden she imposes? The sacrament of Penance and that of the Eucharist. Jesus Christ did not conceal from us that His law, impracticable to human nature when left to itself, would become easy of fulfilment only by the aid of His grace: *The things which are impossible with men, are possible with God.*[2]

Parents are bound to give their children education. In the fulfilment of this great duty, in the choice of good masters, they need advice, most especially in this age,

[1] Hebr. xiii. 4. [2] Luc. xviii, 27.

when such choice is more difficult than ever. The great advantage which the Church supplies to all her docile children is that of having always at their service a good adviser, obliged by his profession, fitted by his knowledge, bound by oath, and aided by the grace of his office, to give always the best councils under the seal of the most absolute secrecy: "Do nothing without counsel," the Holy Ghost admonishes us, "and thou shalt not repent when thou hast done."[1]

The great obstacle which children oppose to the work of education is their natural inclination to rebel against authority. The direction of a confessor is eminently calculated to combat this unhappy spirit. The supernatural authority of the minister of Jesus Christ, who opens or closes the tabernacle at his will, while the sentence he pronounces is ratified in heaven, who points to heaven closed and hell opened as the sanction of the command: "Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother," adds a very serious sanction to the commands of a father, and to the wishes of a mother always so easy to be persuaded. The confessor says to children, to young men, to all, in the words of the Apostle, "Be ye subject to all legitimate authority, not by constraint, but for conscience sake[2] . . . not as obeying man but God." Faith understands these great lessons, the grace of the sacraments affords help in following them, and parents and masters daily gather with happiness the fruits of this docility.

The state or society is but a great family. In order to be perfect, so far as it can be upon earth, society needs to be animated by the spirit of *association*, which makes it strong, compact, unanimous; by the spirit of *subordination*, which maintains it in stability, tranquillity and prosperity; by the spirit of *self-devotion*, which multiplies within it the sacrifices of charity; and lastly, by that spirit of *proselytism*, which leads a nation to communicate to the whole human race the blessings which it enjoys.

[1] Eccli. xxxii. 24. [2] Rom. xiii. 5.

This spirit of association, subordination, self-devotion and proselytism has for its mainspring and rule the directions of the Church, given especially at the holy tribunal.

It will readily be conceived that this direction must form and maintain among all those, who follow it, that *unanimity*, that oneness of principles, of views, of intentions, so much recommended by the Apostle.[1] It eliminates, as much as can be done, divergences arising from prejudices, passions, habits; it establishes charity on the only solid basis of humanity and personal abnegation. In order to obtain this result more easily, all the founders of religious orders have made the confessor, and, as far as possible, the unity of confessor, the foundation and stay of their congregations. Should the foundation fail, the community, broken down by the spirit of division and selfishness, soon becomes a mere ruin.

As the command of a confessor is an act of authority, entirely divine, which Heaven itself obeys, in virtue of those words: "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven," it follows that habitual submission to this high power must dispose the mind to *obey* with reverence, all legitimate authority. Yes, this fruit of a just and wise subordination, so valuable for the stability of states, ripens well under the shade of the confessional. History attests that those men of disorder, whose guilty proceedings have so often endangered society, were generally very little acquainted with penance. A just resistance to the abuses of authority, however, the confessor ought never to repress; it is not his part to make himself the accomplice of oppression. or the jailor of servitude.

The spirit of self-devotion is the soul of society, and alone can save it in the days of calamity. Now that self-devotion, which consecrates to the glory of God and the good of mankind, not only riches, enjoyments, some days of life, but a whole, an entire life, that self-devotion which

[1] Unanimes idipsum sentientes, . . unus spiritus, etc. *Philipp.* ii. 2.

produces in the Church ecclesiastical celibacy, religious vows, the consecration of so many souls to works of mercy, that sacrifice of the whole self which paganism never knew, which heresy cannot imitate, which philosophy cannot even understand, finds its source and its aliment, as we have said, in the Tabernacle and the holy Table; but it is the confessor who opens the tabernacle and prepares the holy table: it is he who excites, animates, raises up, and impels to new immolations the voluntary victim of self-devotion. If you destroy the holy tribunal, you must by the same blow overthrow the Eucharistic table, and therewith the most salutary institutions of Christian charity.

This spirit of self-devoted charity produces that holy passion for doing good afar off, to all and at all times, which is called *zeal* and *proselytism*. The greatest works of true proselytism are the Catholic missions. Now the missionary, in order to sustain and encourage himself; to rise up again, if he ever fall into languor and dejection in presence of the difficulties that beset him, has need to recur from time to time to the director of his soul, his Ananias; while to cure his yet half-barbarous converts of their vices and to form them to virtue, no means is more effectual in his hands than the administration of the sacrament of Penance.

Thus the individual, the family, society and the Church owe to this admirable institution the benefits of christian *civilization*. Without it we should remain under the weight of that anathema: *Unless your justice surpass that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*[1]

It has often been said that the Church was a *civilizer*, and nothing is more true; but it must be acknowledged that she civilizes especially by means of the happy influence which she exercises over men's minds, hearts and consciences, over private and public morals, at the holy tribunal.

[1] Matth. v. 20.

The Protestant Lord Fitzwilliam, in his letters to Atticus, shows that he perfectly understood and would not suppress this truth. His position is, that no firm and beneficial government can be found external to the Catholic Church; because nothing can replace the tribunal, to which souls come to submit themselves, before being united to the God-man in the Eucharistic feast.

These conclusions will not surprise any who regard Jesus Christ as the law-giver of society, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life of the World, and the priest as His minister. The testimony of Leibnitz is not less remarkable. In his System of Theology he says:

"The institution of sacramental confession is assuredly worthy of the divine wisdom, and of all the doctrines of religion it is the most admirable and the most beautiful. It was admired by the Chinese and the inhabitants of Japan. The necessity of confessing sin is sufficient to preserve from it those who still preserve their modesty; and yet, if any fail, confession consoles and restores them. I look on a grave and prudent confessor as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls. His counsels regulate the sentiments, reprove vices, remove occasions of sin, cause the restitution of ill-acquired property, and the reparation of wrongs, clear up doubts, console under afflictions, in fine, cure or relieve all the evils of the soul; and as nothing in the world is more precious than a faithful friend, what is the value of that friend, when he is bound by his functions and fitted by his knowledge to devote to you all his care under the seal of the most inviolable secrecy?"

I shall be pardoned for adding a few lines more to these quotations. I extract them faithfully from a thesis maintained at Geneva, in 1839, which I have already cited.

"It seems to me," says M. Neville, "that it is sufficient to look into one's self, in order to understand how it is that the Roman Church, with the graces of which she has the disposal, and with her divine authority, finds sup-

port in the deepest needs of our souls. Amid those dry and at the same time impassioned polemics that disfigure the truth of Christ, who has not desired at times, when tossed on the waves of uncertainty and doubt to find a quiet haven in an authority which can say to him: Here is truth!

"Who has not turned a longing eye to the tribunal of Penance? Who has not yearned, in the bitterness of remorse and in uncertainty as to the divine forgiveness, to hear the lips which can say to him with the power of Christ: 'Go in peace: thy sins are forgiven thee.'

"Happy is he who has never experienced such impressions! Happy that pure soul which has preserved so vivid a sense of God's presence, so entire a faith in the Saviour's promises as never to have felt the need of finding on earth an infallible organ of the will of heaven!

"For myself .... if I believed that I had found that supernatural power which the Church attributes to herself; that power the precious and unfailing source of reconciliations, restitutions, effectual repentance, of all that God most loves after innocence, standing beside the cradle which it blesses, standing again beside the dying bed, and amid the most pathetic exhortations and the most tender adieus, saying, 'Depart, Christian soul'[1] .... if I believed that I had found such a power upon earth, there often are moments when I would joyfully lay down at its feet this liberty of conscience which at times presents itself much more as a burden than as a privilege."

Such is the abyss of doubt and disquietude into which the Reformers of the Christian world have plunged the souls of men. They have deprived poor sinners of that powerful help which the fathers called "the plank after shipwreck," and as Scheffmacher has in his fourth book proved too well, have brought about that most deplorable result, "that Protestants die in their sins, for want of receiving absolution."

[1] Du Pape, t. ii. p. 76.

Voltaire said,[1] "The enemies of the Roman Church, who have assailed the salutary institution of confession, appear to have removed the strongest restraint which can be put upon secret crimes. The sages of antiquity themselves felt the importance of it."

The inhabitants of Nuremberg, filled with consternation at the sight of the excesses introduced by the reformation, petitioned Charles V. for the restoration of the tribunal of penance. The people of Strasburg addressed the same request to their magistrates.[2] The Puseyite clergy in England, the pietist Dr. Herder at Strasburg, are introducing the practice of auricular confession among their followers.

But men can easily destroy the works of God, they cannot so easily reconstruct them. In 1829, a Protestant doctor, a delegate to the King of Prussia, said: "I could not recommend to your Majesty anything more warmly, more urgently, than confession. The Church has no means more effectual for keeping christians in the fear of God, which is the principle of the fear, the service and the submission, which they owe to their Sovereign. Error on this subject, although undoubtedly those who diffuse it are unconscious thereof, is the germ of rebellion, and menaces the safety of thrones." [3]

III.

Ceremonies of the Sacrament of Penance.

It remains to say a few words on the ceremonies of the sacrament of Penance. Such an explanation will clear up some points of doctrine which our adversaries seem obstinate in refusing to understand.

"Confession being the most manifest part of the sacrament of Penance," says Manzoni,[4] "the practice has grown up of calling the whole sacrament, confession. But

[1] Annales de l'Empire, t. i, p. 41.
[2] Lettres de Scheffmacher, lettre 4me, near the end.
[3] Journal evangelique de Berlin, n. 81. [4] Ch. viii, at the end.

this inaccuracy of expression has not passed into the ideas (of Catholics); for the necessity of sorrow, of good resolutions and of satisfaction, is so universally taught, that there is not a catechism which does not inculcate it, nor a child admitted to confession who does not know it."

In every sacrament we distinguish between the *matter*, or element employed to institute (as it were) the body of the sacramental action, and the *form*, or the words pronounced by the minister, which invest that action with its complete significance. Water is the element of Baptism; the words "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," are its form.

What stands for the matter in the sacrament of Penance are the three acts of the penitent, which on this very account are as necessary to the completeness of the sacrament as water to the conferring of Baptism. These acts are *contrition*, *confession* and *satisfaction*.

Contrition is defined by the Council,[1] "a sorrow of mind, and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future. This sorrow," it proceeds, "when it is united with confidence in the divine mercy, and with the desire of performing the other things which are required for rightly receiving this sacrament," prepares those who have fallen after baptism, for the remission of their sins. In case contrition were made perfect by charity, it would immediately reconcile man to God, even before receiving the sacrament, not however without the desire of receiving it, a desire which is involved in charity.

The confession ought to acknowledge "all the mortal sins of which, after a diligent examination of conscience, penitents are conscious, even though those sins be most hidden, and committed only against the two last precepts of the decalogue;" and also "those circumstances which change the species of the sin."[2] It certainly is not *impossible* to comply with this condition.[3] Venial sins are not

[1] Sess. xiv. c. 4. [2] Sess. xiv. can. 7. [3] Sess. xiv. can. 8.

necessarily matter of this self-accusation.[1] Sins, even though they be mortal, that are involuntarily forgotten after a sufficient examination are remitted with the others.

The *satisfaction* is imposed by the minister of the sacrament, as a *judge*, and in virtue of his power of *binding*. It ought to be at once punitive, preservative, remedial, and proportioned alike to the offence and to the strength of the penitent. This satisfaction or penance should stand to him in place of a part of the temporal punishment which ordinarily remains to be undergone for sin when the guilt has been effaced and the eternal punishment remitted, as we shall have occasion to prove in another chapter.

Of these three acts of the penitent contrition is the most indispensible: the confession may, in certain cases, be made by signs; the will to *make satisfaction*, or the acceptance of the penance is sufficient to make the matter of the sacrament complete. The execution of this will or the accomplishment of the penance is considered as a non-essential, though integrant part of the sacrament.

As to the *form* of administration, it is as follows, according to the Roman ritual. The sacrament is ordinarily administered in the church, before some altar. The confessional may serve as a pendant to the baptistery. The priest is seated in his tribunal, vested in a surplice and a violet stole. "Pray, father, give me your blessing, for I have sinned," exclaims the returning prodigal, as he bends his knees. Then he says, "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever Virgin, ... and to you, father," etc.; to which the priest replies, "The Lord be in thy heart and on thy lips, to help thee to confess aright all thy sins." The penitent then accuses himself, assisted, as often as there is need, by the confessor, but he is not reproved till his confession is finished. The minister of mercy ought to "encourage him, to give him confidence,

[1] Sess. xiv. ch. 5.

to suggest with all kindness, what he forgets, but not to ask questions except with prudence. After he has heard all, then with fatherly kindness and after considering the number and gravity of the sins committed, he gives him seasonable counsels, and merited reproofs, endeavors to lead him to sorrow and contrition by efficacious exhortations, persuades him to mend his life and regulate it better, and suggests the remedies suited to his sins .... Then a salutary penance, chosen with great circumspection and with the counsel of the Spirit of God ... Those who give no sign of sorrow, who persist in their hatred and ill-will, who refuse to restore the property of others, when they are able to do it, or to relinquish the proximate occasions of sin and the sin itself, or to repair a public scandal, those again whose sins are reserved to superior authorities, are incapable of receiving absolution."[1]

When it is to be granted, and after the salutary penance has been imposed and accepted, the priest says first: "Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee all thy sins, and bring thee to everlasting life. Amen."

Then with his right hand raised over the penitent: "The Almighty and merciful God grant thee pardon, absolution, and remission of all thy sins. Amen.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee: and by His authority I absolve thee from every bond of excommunication and interdict, so far as I have power and thou hast need.

"I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the saints, whatever good thou hast done, and whatever evil thou hast endured, be imputed to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of everlasting life. Amen."

At these words Lazarus comes forth from his grave. The prodigal child, is restored to his father; he who but

[1] Rit. Rom. *Ordo adm. Sacr. Pœnit.*

just before was a sinner, now, reconciled to his God, at peace with himself, his heart relieved from an enormous load, tastes a happiness which sin never gave, and which seemed to be exclusively reserved for innocence. Hell is closed beneath his feet, heaven is open over his head, the Angels rejoice in his resurrection, the heart of the Good Shepherd thrills with joy, and the tabernacle opens; "for it is fit to make merry and be glad, for this brother that was dead and is come to life again, that was lost and is found."[1]

IV.

Errors and Variations of Protestants.

This holy practice, this pure doctrine found no favor in the eyes of the Reformers. Their system of justification by faith only, of the impossibility of losing justification, of the emptiness of our merits and satisfactions, of the universality of the priesthood, was at every point irreconcilable with the Catholic doctrine regarding the sacrament of Penance.

But it is difficult to unlearn suddenly what one has learned, loved, practised, all one's life. And accordingly Luther was continually carried by the stream of habit far from the path of logical consistency.

First, let us see how the orthodox Luther resolves the principal questions relating to the sacrament of Penance. His answers, faithfully extracted from his works, have been collected by Ussleber.[2]

"Question. Is Penance a sacrament?—Answer. "Yes."[3]

Q. Do you reject the three parts of the sacrament of Penance, as the old theologians teach them, that is to say, contrition, confession, and satisfaction?—A. "It is a deceit to say that I annihilate contrition and consider it

[1] Luc. xv. 32.

[2] Catechisme nouveau, ou Points de la doctrine catholique enseignés par Luther, Invariable, t. 6, p. 344.

[3] Latin edition of Wittemberg, 1546, Part vii, fol. 3.

superfluous, and that I do away with confession or reject satisfaction."[1]

Q. What is confession?—A. "Confession includes first the declaration of our sins; then absolution, or the pardon which is received from the confessor."[2]

Q. Is confession necessary?—A. "There is no doubt that confession is necessary and established by God. But secret and auricular confession, as it is practised at this day, pleases me especially; it is not only useful, it is necessary. God forbid that I should wish for its abolition; I rejoice that it exists in the church of Jesus Christ, because it is the only means of restoring peace to troubled consciences."[3]

Q. What are the inducements to confession?—A. "Two motives ought to lead us to confess our sins: first, the sacrifice of the cross: because the humiliation and shame which a man feels in accusing himself, in uncovering his confession before other men is a precious portion of the cross of Christ. Oh! if we knew how great is the merit before God of this voluntary shame, how it draws down His mercy on a man who thus humbles and annihilates himself in order to honor Him . . . if we really understood this we would dig into the earth for confession, and go a thousand miles to seek it.[4] The whole Scripture attests the mercy of God towards one who humbles himself. . . . No fasts, prayers, absolutions, sufferings are so salutary as this voluntary humiliation. And in fact, what is it to have to blush before one single man, when at death, which is never far from us, we shall have to blush before God, angels and devils, which will be a thousand times more terrible, and which we can easily prevent by enduring this light confusion before one single man? I know not, whether he can have a living faith who is un-

[1] Part vii. fol. 133. [2] Part v, fol. 318, comm. on Jonas.
[3] T. i, fol. 84.
[4] Wir würden die Beicht aus der Erde graben, und über tausend Meilen holen.

able to resign himself to endure confusion before a human being, and thus refuses to bear so slight a portion of the cross of Jesus Christ. The second motive which ought to lead us to confess our faults, is that precious promise of God Himself: What you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, . . Whose sins you remit they are remitted."[1]

Nevertheless Luther wrote to the inhabitants of Frankfort, that confession is a cruel invention of the Pope, and boasted that the religion preached by him had put an end to that tyranny. According to him there is no difference between this institution and the forgiveness of injuries; you have offended your brother, you apologize, he forgives you; and all is finished.[2] Thus any one may exercise this ministry of reconciliation, for it implies no powers, it is only the declaration of an acquittal, which has been pronounced in heaven; and no circumstances have to be confessed beyond this: "I have sinned against my brother," in which confession is included the acknowledgment of all the sins committed; and the Pope is guilty of a tyrannical encroachment on the rights of men, when he grants to priests alone the power of absolving, or reserves the absolution of some sins to certain dignitaries of the Church, &c., &c.

The Confession of Augsburg says that, Penance is a sacrament, and specifies as its integral parts; "the *terror* with which the mind is possessed at the remembrance of its sins, and the *conviction* that its sins are forgiven by Jesus Christ. As to confession, it is preserved, but the enumeration and acknowledgment particularly of all the sins committed are dispensed with. This detailed confession is, according to Melancthon, a torture of the soul. Absolution must necessarily precede the reception of the Eucharist.

The articles of Smalcald recommend the practice of confession, particularly for the guidance of the young, and as a means calculated to keep them in the path of

[1] Part vii. of confession. [2] *De Captiv. Babyl. De Pœnit.*

virtue; as if, in the family of our heavenly Father, all men were not children!

The disciples of Luther finished, in fact, by renouncing the sacrament of Penance. The disciples of Calvin arrived still earlier at the same conclusion, for their system of justification made the loss of justice still more difficult. It was a waste of time, therefore, to trouble yourself much about recovering it. They maintained, however, for some time a certain sort of absolution, useless alike to the elect, who are saved without it, and to the reprobate, to whom it could not convey justice. It seems, too, as if when destroying the tribunal of Penance with one hand, they were trying to restore it with the other. For the catechism of Supperville, which is generally esteemed by Protestants, says: "They who have scandalized the church by their sins ought to confess them before the officers of the church; and it is allowed to each individual sinner, who feels his conscience burdened with any great sin, to open his heart to his pastor, in order to receive from him the counsels necessary." And in the section following: "The ministry of reconciliation has been committed to the pastors. They have the right of declaring to sinners that they are separated from the communion of the church, and ought to abstain from the holy supper, in order to repair the scandal of which they have been the cause."

The established Church of England, in the instructions which it gives to its ministers for the Visitation of the Sick, thus expresses itself. "Here shall the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort:" (then follows almost word for word the Catholic form of absolution). For centuries, however, in Protestant England, this absolution has not been requested by the sick nor given by the minister.

The Oxford school is now endeavoring to restore the

practice without as yet admitting the necessity of confession; and acknowledges its divine institution and inestimable advantages. In 1845, Dr. Pusey wrote to one of his friends on the preparation requisite for general confession, asking the divine assistance, examining the conscience &c. his explanation being substantially in accordance with Catholic teaching. Since that time, notwithstanding the disapprobation and opposition of the bishops of the established church, the practice of auricular confession has made great progress among the Puseyites. This fact is attested by legal proceedings which have been heard of throughout Europe, and by speeches addressed to Parliament. On this point, as on many others, learned and pious Anglicans, have said with the Apostles; "We ought to obey God rather than man." The disinterested zeal with which they have repudiated the opinions and practices of Protestantism, in order to embrace the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, cannot remain long without its reward. But while Puseyites, enlightened by tradition, go to confession, exposing themselves thereby to all manner of annoyances, shall we find Catholics so blinded by prejudice as to reject the divinely appointed remedy of Penance, when it is administered in a way that is certainly legitimate and effectual?

V.

FOURTEENTH SESSION.

HELD NOVEMBER 25, 1551.

Doctrine on the Sacrament of Penance.

The sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, —lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same Legate and Nuncios of the holy Apostolic See presiding therein,—although, in the decree concerning Justification, there has been, through a certain kind of necessity, on account of the affinity of the subjects, much discourse introduced touching the sacrament of Penance; nevertheless, so great, in these our days, is the mul-

titude of various errors relative to this sacrament, that it will be of no small public utility to have given thereof a more exact and full definition, wherein, all errors having been, under the protection of the Holy Ghost, pointed out and extirpated, Catholic truth may be made clear and resplendent; which (Catholic truth) this holy Synod now sets before all Christians to be perpetually retained.

CHAPTER I.

On the necessity, and on the institution of the Sacrament of Penance.

If such, in all the regenerate, were their gratitude towards God, as that they constantly preserved the justice received in baptism by His bounty and grace; there would not have been need of another sacrament, besides that of baptism itself, to be instituted for the remission of sins. But because God, *rich in mercy, knows our frame*,[1] He hath bestowed a remedy of life even on those who may, after baptism, have delivered themselves up to the servitude of sin, and the power of the devil,—the sacrament, to wit, of Penance, by which the benefit of the death of Christ is applied to those who have fallen after baptism. Penitence was indeed at all times necessary, in order to attain to grace and justice, for all men who had defiled themselves by any mortal sin, even for those who begged to be washed by the sacrament of Baptism; that so, their perverseness renounced and amended, they might, with a hatred of sin and a godly sorrow of mind, detest so great an offence of God. Wherefore the prophet says: *Be converted and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity shall not be your ruin.*[2] The Lord also said: *Except you do penance, you shall all likewise perish;*[3] and Peter, the prince of the Apostles, recommending penitence to sinners, who were about to be initiated by baptism, said: *Do penance and be baptized every one of you.*[4] Nevertheless, neither before the coming of Christ was penitence a sacrament, nor is it such, since His coming, to any previously to Baptism. But the Lord then principally instituted the sacrament of Penance, when, being raised from the dead, He breathed upon His disciples, saying: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.*[5] By which action so signal, and words so clear, the consent of all the Fathers has ever understood, that the power of *forgiving and retaining* sins was com-

[1] Ps. cii. 14. [2] Ezech. xviii. 30. [3] Luc. xiii. 5.
[4] Act. ii. 38. [5] Joan. xx. 23.

municated to the apostles and their lawful successors, for the reconciling of the faithful, who have fallen after Baptism. And the Catholic Church with great reason repudiated and condemned as heretics, the Novatians, who of old obstinately denied that power of forgiving. Wherefore this holy Synod, approving of and receiving, as most true, this meaning of those words of our Lord, condemns the fanciful interpretations of those who, in opposition to the institution of this sacrament, falsely wrest those words to the power of preaching the word of God, and of announcing the Gospel of Christ.

CHAPTER II.

On the difference between the Sacrament of Penance and that of Baptism.

For the rest, this sacrament is clearly seen to be different from Baptism in many respects: for besides that it is very widely different indeed in matter and form, which constitute the essence of a sacrament, it is beyond doubt certain that the minister of Baptism need not be a judge, seeing that the Church exercises judgment on no one, who has not entered therein through the gate of Baptism. For, *what have I,* saith the Apostle, *to do to judge them that are without?*[1] It is otherwise with those who are of *the household of the faith,* whom Christ our Lord has once, by the laver of Baptism, made the members of His own body; for such, if they should afterwards have defiled themselves by any crime, He would no longer have them cleansed by a repetition of Baptism—that being nowise lawful in the Catholic Church—but be placed as criminals before this tribunal; that, by the sentence of the priests, they might be freed, not once, but as often as, being penitent, they should, from their sins committed, flee thereunto. Furthermore, one is the fruit of Baptism and another that of Penance. For, by Baptism, *putting on Christ,*[2] we are made therein, entirely a new creature, obtaining a full and entire remission of all sins; unto which newness and entireness, however, we are no ways able to attain by the sacrament of Penance, without many tears and great labors on our part, the divine justice demanding this: so that Penance has been justly called by the holy Fathers a laborious kind of Baptism.[3] And this sacrament of Penance is, for those who have fallen after Baptism necessary unto salvation; as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated.

[1] 1 Cor. v. 12. [2] Gal. iii. 23.
[3] Gr. Naz. or. 39; J. Damasc. L. iv. de Fide, c. 10.

CHAPTER III.

On the parts, and on the fruit of this Sacrament.

The holy Synod doth furthermore teach, that the form of the sacrament of Penance, wherein its force principally consists, is placed in those words of the minister, *I absolve thee*, &c.; to which words indeed certain prayers are, according to the custom of holy Church, laudably joined, which nevertheless by no means regard the essence of that form, neither are they necessary for the administration of the sacrament itself. But the acts of the penitent himself, to wit, contrition, confession and satisfaction, are as it were the matter[1] of this sacrament. Which acts, inasmuch as they are, by God's institution, required in the penitent for the integrity of the sacrament, and for the full and perfect remission of sins, are for this reason called the parts of penance But the thing signified[2] indeed and the effect of this sacrament, as far as regards its force and efficacy, is reconciliation with God, which sometimes, in persons, who are pious and who receive this sacrament with devotion, is wont to be followed by peace and serenity of conscience, with exceeding consolation of spirit. The holy Synod, whilst delivering these things, touching the parts and the effect of this sacrament, condemns at the same time the opinions of those who contend that, the terrors which agitate the conscience, and faith, are the parts of penance.

CHAPTER IV.

On Contrition.

Contrition which holds the first place amongst the aforesaid acts of the penitent, is a sorrow of mind, and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future.[3] This movement of contrition was at all times necessary for obtaining the pardon of sins; and, in one who has fallen after Baptism, it then at length prepares for the remission of sins, when it is united with confidence in the divine mercy, and with the desire of performing the other things which are required for rightly receiving this sacrament. Wherefore the holy Synod declares, that this contrition contains not only a cessation from sin, and the purpose and the beginning of a new life, but also a hatred of the old,[4] agreeably to that saying: Cast away from you all your iniquities, wherein you have *transgressed, and make to your-*

[1] Quasi materia. [2] Res.
[3] Animi dolor, ac detestatio de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cætero.
[4] Veteris, past.

selves a new heart and a new spirit.[1] And assuredly he who has considered those cries of the saints; *To thee only have I sinned, and have done evil before thee,*[2] *I have labored in my groaning, every night I will wash my bed,*[3] *I will recount to thee all my years, in the bitterness of my soul,*[4] and others of this kind, will easily understand that they flowed from a certain vehement hatred of their past life, and from an exceeding detestation of sins. The Synod teaches moreover, that, although it sometimes happen, that this contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God before this sacrament be actually received, the said reconciliation, nevertheless, is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament, which is included therein. And as to that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, because that it is commonly conceived either from the consideration of the baseness of sin, or from the fear of hell and of punishment, It declares that if, with the hope of pardon, it exclude the wish to sin,[5] it not only does not make a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, but that it is even a gift of God, and an impulse of the Holy Ghost,—who does not indeed as yet dwell in the penitent, but only moves him,—whereby the penitent being assisted prepares a way for himself unto justice. And although this (attrition) cannot of itself, without the sacrament of Penance, conduct the sinner to justification, yet does it dispose him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of Penance. For, smitten profitably with this fear, the Ninevites, at the preaching of Jonas, did fearful penance and obtained mercy from the Lord. Wherefore falsely do some calumniate Catholic writers, as if they had maintained that the sacrament of Penance confers grace without any good motion on the part of those, who receive it; and falsely also do they assert that contrition is extorted and forced, not free and voluntary.

CHAPTER V.

On Confession.

From the institution of the sacrament of Penance as already explained, the universal Church has always understood, that the entire confession of sins was also instituted by the Lord, and is of divine right necessary for all, who have fallen after baptism; because that our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to ascend from earth to heaven, left priests His own vicars, as presidents and judges, unto whom all the mortal crimes, into which the faithful

[1] Ezch. xviii. 31. [2] Ps. i. 6. [3] Ps. vi. 7.
[4] Is. xxxviii. 15. [5] Voluntatem peccandi.

of Christ may have fallen, should be carried,[1] in order that, in accordance with the power of the keys, they may pronounce the sentence of forgiveness or retention of sins.[2] For it is manifest, that priests could not have exercised this judgment without knowledge of the cause; neither indeed could they have observed equity in enjoining punishments, if the said faithful should have declared their sins in general only, and not rather specifically, and one by one. Whence it is gathered that all the mortal sins, of which, after a diligent examination of themselves, they are conscious, must needs be by penitents enumerated in confession, even though those sins be most hidden, and committed only against the two last precepts of the decalogue,—sins which sometimes wound the soul more grievously, and are more dangerous, than those which are committed outwardly. For venial sins, whereby we are not excluded from the grace of God, and into which we fall more frequently, although they be rightly and profitably, and without any presumption declared in confession, as the custom of pious persons demonstrates, yet may they be omitted without guilt, and be expiated by many other remedies. But, whereas all mortal sins, even those of thought, render men *children of wrath*,[3] and enemies of God, it is necessary to seek also for the pardon of them all from God, with an open and modest confession. Wherefore, while the faithful of Christ are careful to confess, all the sins which occur to their memory, they without doubt lay them all bare before the mercy of God, to be pardoned; whereas they who act otherwise, and knowingly keep back certain sins, such set nothing before the divine bounty to be forgiven through the priest: for if the sick be ashamed to show his wound to the physician, his medical art cures not that, which it knows not of. We gather furthermore, that those circumstances, which change the species of the sin, are also to be explained in confession, because that, without them, the sins themselves are neither entirely set forth by the penitents, nor are they known clearly to the judges; and it cannot be that they can estimate rightly the grievousness of the crimes, and impose on the penitents the punishment, which ought to be inflicted, on account of them. Whence it is unreasonable to teach, that these circumstances have been invented by idle men; or, that one circumstance only is to be confessed, to wit, that one has sinned against a brother. But it is also impious to assert, that confession, enjoined to be made in this manner, is impossible, or to call

[1] Deferantur, should be accused.

[2] This passage may also be rendered: that, in accordance with the power of the keys for the forgiveness or retention of sins, they may pronounce sentence.

[3] Ephes. ii. 3.

it a slaughter-house of consciences: for it is certain, that in the Church nothing else is required of penitents, but that, after each has examined himself diligently, and searched all the folds and recesses of his conscience, he confess those sins by which he shall remember that he has mortally offended his Lord and God: whilst the other sins, which do not occur to him after diligent thought, are understood to be included as a whole[1] in that same confession; for which sins we confidently say with the prophet: *From my secret sins cleanse me, O Lord.*[2] Now, the very difficulty of a confession like this, and the shame of making known one's sins, might indeed seem a grievous thing, were it not alleviated by the so many and so great advantages and consolations, which are most assuredly bestowed by absolution upon all, who worthily approach to this sacrament. For the rest, as to the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, although Christ has not forbidden that a person may,—in punishment of his sins, and for his own humiliation, as well for an example to others as for the edification of the Church that has been scandalized,—confess his sins publicly, nevertheless this is not commanded by a divine precept; neither would it be very prudent[3] to enjoin by any human law, that sins, especially such as are secret, should be made known by a public confession. Wherefore, whereas the secret sacramental confession, which was in use from the beginning in holy Church, and is still also in use, has always been commended by the most holy and the most ancient Fathers with a great and unanimous consent, the vain calumny of those is manifestly refuted, who are not ashamed to teach, that confession is alien from the divine command, and is a human invention, and that it took its rise from the Fathers assembled in the Council of Lateran: for the Church did not, through the Council of Lateran, ordain that the faithful of Christ should confess,—a thing which it knew to be necessary, and to be instituted of divine right,—but that the precept of confession should be complied with, at least once a year, by all and each, when they have attained to years of discretion. Whence, throughout the whole Church, the salutary custom is, to the great benefit of the souls, now observed, of confessing at that most sacred and most acceptable time of Lent,—a custom which this holy Synod most highly approves of and embraces, as pious and worthy of being retained.

[1] In universum. [2] Ps. xviii. 13. [3] Satis consulte.

CHAPTER VI.

On the ministry of this Sacrament, and on Absolution.

But, as regards the minister of this sacrament, the holy Synod declares all these doctrines to be false, and utterly alien from the truth of the Gospel, which perniciously extend the ministry of the keys to any others soever besides bishops and priests; imagining, contrary to the institution of this sacrament, that those words of our Lord, *Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven,*[1] and, *Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,*[2] were in such wise addressed to all the faithful of Christ indifferently and indiscriminately, as that every one has the power of forgiving sins;—public sins, to wit, by rebuke, provided he that is rebuked shall acquiesce, and secret sins by a voluntary confession made to any individual whatsoever. It also teaches, that even priests who are in mortal sin, exercise, through the virtue of the Holy Ghost, which was bestowed in ordination, the office of forgiving sins, as the ministers of Christ; and that their sentiment is erroneous, who contend that this power exists not in bad priests. But although the absolution of the priest is the dispensation of another's bounty, yet is it not a bare ministry only, whether of announcing the Gospel, or of declaring that sins are forgiven, but is after the manner of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as by a judge; and therefore the penitent ought not so to confide[3] in his own personal faith, as to think that,—even though there be no contrition on his part, or no intention on the part of the priest of acting seriously and absolving truly,—he is nevertheless truly and in God's sight absolved, on account of his faith alone. For neither would faith without penance bestow any remission of sins; nor would he be otherwise than most careless of his own salvation, who, knowing that a priest but absolved him in jest, should not carefully seek for another, who would act in earnest.

CHAPTER VII.

On the Reservation of Cases.

Wherefore, since the nature and order of a judgment require this, that sentence be passed only on those subject (to that judicature,) it has ever been firmly held in the Church of God, and

[1] Matth. xviii. 18. [2] Joan. xx. 23.
[3] Sibi blandiri, flatter himself upon.

this Synod ratifies it as a thing most true, that the absolution, which a priest pronounces upon one over whom he has not either an ordinary or a delegated jurisdiction, ought to be of no weight whatever. And it hath seemed to our most holy Fathers to be of great importance to the discipline of the Christian people, that certain more atrocious and more heinous crimes should be absolved, not by all priests, but only by the highest priests: whence the Sovereign Pontiffs, in virtue of the supreme power delivered to them in the universal Church, were deservedly able to reserve, for their special judgment, certain more grievous cases of crimes. Neither is it to be doubted,—seeing that all things, that are from God, are well ordered,—but that this same may be lawfully done by all bishops, each in his own diocese; unto edification, however, not unto destruction, in virtue of the authority, above (that of) other inferior priests, delivered to them over their subjects, especially as regards those crimes, to which the censure of excommunication is annexed. But it is consonant to the divine authority, that this reservation of cases have effect, not merely in external polity, but also in God's sight. Nevertheless, for fear lest any may perish on this account, it has always been very piously observed in the said Church of God, that there be no reservation at the point of death, and that therefore all priests may absolve all penitents whatsoever from every kind of sins and censures whatever: and as, save at that point of death, priests have no power in reserved cases, let this alone be their endeavor to persuade penitents to repair to superior and lawful judges for the benefit of absolution.

CHAPTER VIII.

On the necessity and on the fruit of Satisfaction.

Finally, as regards satisfaction,—which, as it is, of all the parts of penance, that which has been at all times recommended to the Christian people by our Fathers, so is it the one especially, which in our age is, under the loftiest pretext of piety, impugned by those, who have *an appearance of godliness, but have denied the power thereof*,[1]—the holy Synod declares, that it is wholly false and alien from the word of God, that the guilt[2] is never forgiven by the Lord, without the whole punishment also being therewith pardoned. For clear and illustrious examples are found in the sacred writings, whereby, besides by divine tradition, this error is refuted in the plainest manner possible. And truly the nature of divine justice seems to demand, that they, who through ignorance have sinned before baptism, be received

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 5. [2] Culpam.

into grace in one manner; and in another those who, after having been freed from the servitude of sin and of the devil, and after having received the gift of the Holy Ghost, have not feared, knowingly *to violate the temple of God*,[1] *and to grieve the Holy Spirit*.[2] And it beseems the divine clemency, that sins be not in such wise pardoned us without any satisfaction, as that taking occasion therefrom, thinking sins less grievous, we offering as it were an insult and an *outrage to the Holy Ghost*,[3] should fall into more grievous sins, *treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath*.[4] For, doubtless, these satisfactory punishments greatly recall from sin, and check as it were with a bridle, and make penitents more cautious and watchful for the future. They are also remedies for the remains of sin, and, by acts of the opposite virtues, they remove the habits acquired by evil living. Neither indeed was there ever in the Church of God any way accounted surer to turn aside the impending chastisement of the Lord, than that men should, with true sorrow of mind, practise these works of penitence. Add to these things, that, whilst we thus, by making satisfaction, suffer for our sins, we are made conformable to Jesus Christ, who satisfied for our sins, from whom all our *sufficiency is*;[5] having also thereby a most sure pledge that *if we suffer with Him, we shall also be glorified with Him*.[6] But neither is this satisfaction, which we discharge for our sins, so our own, as not to be through Jesus Christ. For we, who can do nothing of ourselves, as of ourselves, can do all things, He co-operating, who strengthens us. Thus, man has not wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ; in whom we live; in whom we merit; in whom we satisfy; *bringing forth fruits worthy of penance*,[7] which from Him have their efficacy; by Him are offered to the Father; and through Him are accepted by the Father. Therefore the priests of the Lord ought, as far as the Spirit and prudence shall suggest, to enjoin salutary and suitable satisfactions, according to the quality of the crimes and the ability of the penitent; lest, if haply they connive at sins, and deal too indulgently with penitents, by enjoining certain very light works, for very grievous crimes, they be made partakers of other men's sins. But let them have in view, that the satisfaction, which they impose, be not only for the preservation of a new life and a medicine of infirmity,[8] but also for the avenging and punishing of past sins. For the ancient Fathers likewise both believe and teach, that the keys of the priests were given, not to *loose* only, but also to *bind*. But not therefore did they

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 17. [2] Ephes. iv. 30. [3] Hebr. x. 29.
[4] Rom. ii. 4. [5] 2 Cor. iii. 5. [6] Rom. viii. 17.
[7] Matth. iii. 18.
[8] Infirmitatis mendicamentum, a remedy against weakness.

imagine that the sacrament of Penance is a tribunal of wrath or of punishments; even as no Catholic ever thought, that, by this kind of satisfactions on our part, the efficacy of the merit and of the satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ is either obscured, or in any way lessened: which when the innovators seek to understand, they in such wise maintain a new life to be the best penance, as to take away the entire efficacy, and use of satisfaction.

CHAPTER IX.

On Works of Satisfaction.

The Synod teaches furthermore, that so great is the liberality of the divine munificence, that we are able through Jesus Christ to make satisfaction to God the Father, not only by punishments voluntarily undertaken, of ourselves for the punishment of sin, or by those imposed at the discretion of the priest according to the measure of our delinquincy, but also, which is a very great proof of love, by the temporal scourges inflicted by God, and borne patiently by us.

Canons on the most Holy Sacrament of Penance.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after Baptism; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one, confounding the sacraments, saith that Baptism is itself the sacrament of Penance, as though these two sacraments were not distinct, and that therefore Penance is not rightly called a second plank after shipwreck; let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one saith, that those words of the Lord the Saviour, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,*[1] are not to be understood of the power of forgiving and of retaining sins, in the sacrament of Penance, as the Catholic Church has always from the beginning understood them; but wrests them, contrary to the institution of this sacrament, to the power of preaching the gospel; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one denieth, that, for the entire and perfect remission of sins, there are required three acts in the penitent, which are as it were the matter of the sacrament of Penance; to wit, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are

[1] Joan. xx. 22, 23.

called the three parts of penance; or saith that there are two parts only of penance, to wit, the terrors with which the conscience is smitten upon being convinced of sin, and the faith, generated[1] by the Gospel, or by the absolution, whereby one believes that his sins are forgiven him through Christ; let him be anathema.

CANON V.—If any one saith, that the contrition which is acquired by means of the examination, collection and detestation of sins,—whereby one *thinks over his years in the bitterness of his soul*,[2] by pondering on the grievousness, the multitude, the filthiness of his sins, the loss of eternal blessedness, and the eternal damnation which he has incurred, having therewith the purpose of a better life,—is not a true and profitable sorrow, does not prepare for grace, but makes a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner; in fine, that this (contrition) is a forced and not free and voluntary sorrow; let him be anathema.

CANON VI.—If any one denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right; or saith, that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention; let him be anathema.

CANON VII. If any one saith, that, in the sacrament of Penance, it is not necessary, of divine right, for the remission of sins, to confess all and singular the mortal sins which after due and diligent previous meditation are remembered, even those (mortal sins) which are secret, and those which are opposed to the two last commandments of the Decalogue, as also the circumstances which change the species of a sin; but (saith) that such confession is only useful to instruct and console the penitent, and that it was of old only observed in order to impose a canonical satisfaction; or saith that they, who strive to confess all their sins, wish to leave nothing to the divine mercy to pardon; or, finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII.—If any one saith, that the confession of all sins, such as it is observed in the Church, is impossible, and is a human tradition to be abolished by the godly; or that all and each of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not obliged thereunto once a year, conformably to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran,[3] and that, for this cause, the faithful of Christ are to be persuaded not to confess during Lent; let him be anathema.

CANON IX. If any one saith, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses;

[1] Conceptam, conceived. [2] Is. xxxviii. 15. [3] Cap. omnis utriusque.

provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke; or saith, that the confession of the penitent is not required, in order that the priest may be able to absolve him; let him be anathema.

CANON X. If any one saith, that priests, who are in mortal sin, have not the power of binding and of loosing; or, that not priests alone are the ministers of absolution, but that, to all and each of the faithful of Christ is it said: *Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven;*[1] *and, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;*[2] by virtue of which words every one is able to absolve from sins, to wit, from public sins by reproof only, provided he who is reproved yield thereto, and from secret sins by a voluntary confession; let him be anathema.

CANON XI. If any one saith, that bishops have not the right of reserving cases to themselves, except as regards external polity, and that therefore the reservation of cases hinders not but that a priest may truly absolve from reserved cases; let him be anathema.

CANON XII. If any one saith, that God always remits the whole punishment together with the guilt, and that the satisfaction of penitents is no other than the faith whereby they apprehend[3] that Christ has satisfied for them; let him be anathema.

CANON XIII. If any one saith, that satisfaction for sins, as to their temporal punishment, is nowise made to God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, by the punishments inflicted by Him, and patiently borne, or by those enjoined by the priest, nor even by those voluntarily undertaken, as by fastings, prayers, almsdeeds, or by other works also of piety; and that, therefore, the best penance is merely a new life; let him be anathema.

CANON XIV. If any one saith, that the satisfactions, by which penitents redeem their sins through Jesus Christ, are not a worship of God, but traditions of men, which obscure the doctrine of grace, and the true worship of God; let him be anathema.

CANON XV. If any one saith, that the keys are given to the Church, only *to loose*, not also *to bind;* and that, therefore, priests act contrary to the purpose[4] of the keys, and contrary to the institution of Christ, when they impose punishments on those who confess; and that it is a fiction, that, after the eternal punishment has, by virtue of the keys, been removed, there remains for the most part a temporal punishment to be discharged; let him be anathema.

[1] Matth. xviii. 18.
[2] Joan. xx. 23.
[3] Apprehendunt, account, esteem.
[4] Finem, end.

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

CONTINUATION OF THE FOURTEENTH SESSION.

I.

Divine institution of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Our good Master, during the whole course of His life on earth, manifested more than a mother's compassion for the sick. It was for them that He wrought almost all His miracles. He condescended to visit them: "I will come," He said to the centurion, "and heal thy servant."[1] He knows the cause, the duration, the intensity of their suffering.[2] At the sight of that great crowd, which, forgetful of the necessities of nature, follows Him into the wilderness, He exclaims: "I have compassion on the multitude, for behold they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat: and if I send them away fasting to their homes, they will faint by the way, for some of them came from far off."[3] So great was the multitude of those who pressed upon Him, to obtain the cure of their diseases, that in order to avoid being crushed by them, He was sometimes obliged to go on board a ship, whence He addressed the concourse upon the shore. In short, when the Saviour wished to give the disciples of John the Baptist a summary account of His works, He expressed Himself thus: "The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them."[4] And the Evangelist said yet more briefly: "He went about doing good, and healing all that were suffering."[5]

[1] Matth. viii. 7. [2] Luc. xiii. 16. [3] Marc. viii. 2.
[4] Marc. iii. 9. [5] Matth. xi. 5.

This compassion of the Good Samaritan is not limited to the poor and afflicted people, whom he meets with on His way: His heart is larger, His charity more Catholic, He who calls himself "the healer of Israel,"[1] who says, "Come unto me all you that suffer,"[2] wishes to extend consolation and relief to all that are sick, throughout the whole earth, from the time of His coming in our flesh, to the last day of the world. Above all, for the dying He wished to provide consolation and the cares of the most attentive charity.

The moment of death is the signal for a fearful crisis: it is the moment of *agony*, or of the great struggle; the moment of *extremity*, when all moral and physical sufferings reach their highest point, when life is arriving at its last limit. It is the hour of the last wishes, the last adieus, the last sighs. Time is giving place to eternity, the judgment of man to the judgment of God .... earth is disappearing from under the feet of the dying, leaving him in suspense between heaven and hell.

In his body the sick man experiences intense suffering, in his soul, mortal anguish. To the sense of personal suffering there is often added intense anxiety as to the lot of those beloved ones, from whom he is parting; little orphans, a weeping widow, whom he leaves exposed to a thousand perils greater far than poverty or persecution.

The dying christian needs then to have within his reach, a means of *calm*, which may render his bodily sufferings less violent and acute; which may even delay his death, if it is for the interest of his soul that he obtain a reprieve; he needs to receive an extraordinary grace, in order to remedy the latest ills of the soul and to efface its remaining stains; and lastly, to have an opportunity of procuring for those who survive him the protection and assistance that they will soon need.

Therefore, Jesus Christ, the comforter of the sick and the afflicted, the protector of the orphan and the widow,

[1] Act. x. 38. [2] Exod. xv. 26. [3] Matth. xi. 28.

the crucified Saviour who willed to know by experience the bitterness of death; who Himself caused an angel to be with Him in the garden of Gethsemani, and His Mother and the beloved disciple, when He was upon the cross, has provided for these our last needs, by the institution of the sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Under His eyes, and assuredly by His command, the apostles went forth and "annointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." St. Mark attests this.[1]

St. James, in his catholic Epistle, makes it obligatory for all christians to have recourse to the annointing of the priest in their sicknesses, expressing himself thus: "Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, annointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."[2]

Here we see all the conditions required to constitute a sacrament: the sacramental sign, *anointing* with *oil* (called the oil of the sick) accompanied by *prayer*; grace, "the Lord shall raise him up, and his sins shall be forgiven him;" the minister, "the priests of the church," whether several assemble to pray, as is the custom of the East, or one alone gives the anointing and prays; institution by Jesus Christ, the anointing is made "in the name of the Lord," that is, by His authority and His power. It is, moreover, impossible that St. James should have taken on himself to establish a rite productive of grace; in short, is not that, which he recommends in his Epistle, precisely that which the Apostles practised in their missions, under the direction and by the order of the Saviour Himself? *They anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them.*

Origen,[3] Victor of Antioch,[4] St. John Chrysostom,[5] explain St. James' words as referring to Extreme Unction.

[1] Ungebant oleo multos ægros et sanabant. *Marc.* vi, 12.
[2] Jacob. v. 14.
[3] *Hom.* ii. *in Levit.* n. 4.
[4] In cap. vi. Marc.
[5] *De Sacerd.* lib. iii. n. 6.

St. Irenæus, in relating how the Gnostics imitated, while they corrupted, the sacraments of the Catholics, says that they practised certain anointings on the dying.[1] St. Cyril of Alexandria, in order to prevent christians when sick from seeking health by means of pagan superstitions, reminds them of the virtue of this sacrament.[2] St. Gregory the Great, in his sacramentary, explains at length all that concerns the administration of it. The Venerable Bede, in explaining the sixth chapter of St. Mark, says: "From this it is evident, that the holy Church has received from the Apostles themselves, the practice of anointing the possessed and all others that are sick, with oil consecrated by the blessing of the Bishop." St. Boniface of Mayence, St. Bernard, and a multitude of other Fathers, also mention this sacrament, St. Innocent, the Pope, would have this sacrament refused to those who were undergoing public penance.[3] The rituals of the Greek and Latin churches, nay, even those of sects which have been separated from the Church since the first ages, place Extreme Unction among the sacraments.

"The annointing of the sick," says Leibnitz,[4] "is supported by the words of holy Scripture, and the interpretation of the Church, a safe guide for Catholics. I do not see what objection can be made to this holy custom. Of old it was attended by miraculous cures; this miraculous gift, as well as other extraordinary graces have become less frequent, since the Church was firmly established, but we are not to suppose that even in old times all the sick, who received Extreme Unction, were cured. What remains at this day, what will always remain, and will never deceive us, is the virtue for curing souls, that are suitably disposed; a virtue, which, according to St. James, gives the remission of sins, and increase of faith and courage. Never have we more need of such help than at that hour, when life is in danger, when amid all the terrors of death

[1] *De Hæres*, i. 20.
[2] *De ador. in Spiritu.* l. vi.
[3] *Epist. ad Decent.* n. xi.
[4] *System Theol.*

it is necessary to repel the fiery darts of Satan, then more violent than ever."

II.

Ceremonies of Extreme Unction.

The advantage of this invaluable institution will be better understood when we have witnessed the administration of the sacrament of the dying," as St. Bonaventure calls it.[1]

According to the Roman ritual,[2] the pastor, preceeded by the cross, and accompanied by some clerks, on entering the chamber of the sick person greets him by saying: "Peace be to this house!" The clerks respond, "And to all that dwell therein." Then vested in a surplice and a violet stole, he holds out the cross for the sick man to kiss; if he wishes to confess, he hears him and absolves him. After this the priest comforts him with pious exhortations, instructs him as to the virtue of the sacrament, and particularly applies himself to fortify his soul, and to raise it up to the hope of everlasting life. He then says:

"Let there enter, O Lord Jesus Christ, into this house, at the entrance of our humility, everlasting felicity, divine prosperity, serene gladness, fruitful charity, perpetual health: let the approach of devils flee from this place, let the Angels of peace be present, and let all malignant discord depart from this house. Magnify, O Lord, upon us Thy holy name, and bless our conversation: sanctify the entrance of our humility, who art holy and good, and abidest with the Father and the Holy Ghost forever and ever. Amen.

"Let us pray and beseech our Lord Jesus Christ, that blessing He may bless this tabernacle, and all who dwell therein, and give unto them a good angel for a guardian, and make them serve Him, that they may consider the wonderful things of His law. May He avert from them

[1] *Brevil.* p. vi. c. 6. [2] *Ordo administ. sacrum. Extr. Unctionis.*

all adverse powers; may He deliver them from all fear and from all disquiet, and vouchsafe to keep them in health in this tabernacle. Who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth God, forever and ever. Amen.

"Hear us, O holy Lord, almighty Father, eternal God; and vouchsafe to send Thy holy angel from heaven to guard, cherish, protect, visit and defend all that dwell in this house. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then the sick person, or the assistant of the priest, in his name, repeats the general confession of sins. The pastor responds by the following invocations accompanied by his benediction:

"Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee all thy sins, and bring thee to everlasting life. Amen.

"The almighty and merciful God grant thee pardon, absolution and remission of all thy sins. Amen."

Then, after exhorting all who are present to join in prayer, addressing himself more particularly to the sick person, he says:

"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: may all power of the devil be extinguished in thee, by the imposition of our hands, and by the invocation of all the holy Angels, Archangels, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and all the Saints. Amen."

Then annointing him with holy oil on the eyes, the ears, the nostrils, the mouth, the hands, and the feet, he says:

"Through this holy unction, and through His most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins thou hast committed by seeing .... hearing .... smelling .... taste and speech .... touch .... walking. Amen."

After other prayers he concludes thus:

"Lord God Almighty, who hast spoken by Thine Apostle James, saying; 'Is any man sick among you?

Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, annointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him; cure, we beseech Thee, O our Redeemer, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the languors of this sick man; heal his wounds, and forgive his sins: drive out from him all pains of body and mind, and mercifully restore to him full health, inwardly and outwardly, that, being recovered by the help of Thy mercy, he may return to his former duties. Who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

"Look down, O Lord, we beseech Thee, upon Thy servant N., fainting in the infirmity of his body, and refresh the soul which Thou hast created, that, being amended by chastisements, he may feel himself saved by Thy medicine. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

"O holy Lord, almighty Father, eternal God, who, by pouring the grace of Thy blessing upon sick bodies, dost preserve, by Thy manifold goodness, the work of Thy hands, graciously draw near at the invocation of Thy name, that, delivering Thy servant from sickness, and bestowing health upon him, Thou mayst raise him up by Thy right hand, strengthen him by Thy might, defend him by Thy power, and restore him to Thy holy Church, with all desired prosperity. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

To these solemn and touching prayers, the pastor adds such words of encouragement and consolation as his own heart suggests. He ought to leave the cross of our Saviour before the eyes of the sick man, and so near him that he may embrace and kiss it. When he sees the poor traveller on the point of departing, he gives him as his viaticum (the provision for his journey) "the living bread which gives life everlasting," even Him who has said of Himself. "I am the resurrection and the life. . . He that

eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, I will raise him up in the last day." In order to strengthen the dying man in his last struggles the priest repeats beside him the prayers for the commendation of the soul, and bestows on him the benefit of plenary indulgence on the easiest conditions. We cannot here transcribe in full these exhortations and prayers, which are the simple and sublime expression of the most lively faith and perfect confidence in the divine goodness; but may we all at our last hour be enabled to hear those prayers and share those sentiments!

"Go forth, O Christian soul, from this world, in the name of God the Father almighty, who created thee; in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who suffered for thee; in the name of the Holy Ghost, who was poured out upon thee; in the name of the angels and archangels; . . . in the name of the patriarchs and prophets; . . . . in the name of all the saints of God; may thy place be this day in peace; and thine abode in holy Sion. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

"O God most merciful; O God most loving and kind; O God, who, according to the multitude of thy mercies, blottest out the sins of the penitent, and graciously remittest the guilt of their past offences; look favorably upon this Thy servant, N., and in Thy mercy hear him begging, with the whole confession of his heart, for the remission of all his sins. Renew in him, O most loving Father, whatsoever hath been corrupted through human frailty, or violated through the deceit of the devil; and associate him as a member of redemption, to the unity of the body of the Church, have pity, Lord, on his sighs; have pity on his tears; and admit him, whose only hope is in Thy mercy, to the sacrament of Thy reconciliation. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

"I commend thee to almighty God, dearest brother, and commit thee to Him, whose creature thou art; that, when thou shalt have paid the debt of humanity by death,

thou mayest return to thy Maker, who formed thee of the dust of the earth. As thy soul goeth forth from the body, may the bright company of Angels meet thee; may the judicial senate of Apostles greet thee; may the triumphant army of white robed Martyrs come out to welcome thee; may the band of glowing Confessors, crowned with lilies, encircle thee; may the choir of Virgins, singing jubilees, receive thee; and the embrace of a blessed repose fold thee in the bosom of the Patriarchs; mild and festive may the aspect of Jesus Christ appear to thee, and may He award thee a place among them that stand before Him forever. Mayest thou never know what is terrifying in darkness, dismal in the roaring flames, or excruciating in torments. May foulest Satan, with his crew, give way before thee; . . . . May Christ, who vouchsafed to die for thee, deliver thee from everlasting death. . . May He, the true Shepherd, acknowledge thee among his sheep. . . . . Mayest thou behold thy Redeemer face to face, . . . and set thus among the troops of the blessed, mayest thou enjoy the sweetness of divine contemplation forever and ever. Amen. . . . . .

"We commend to Thee, O Lord, the soul of Thy servant, N., and we beseech Thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour of the world, that Thou wouldst not refuse to receive into the bosom of Thy Patriarchs, a soul for whose sake Thou didst mercifully come down upon earth. Acknowledge, O Lord, Thy creature, not made by strange gods, but by Thee, the only living and true God; for there is no other God beside Thee, and none that doeth according to Thy works. Rejoice his soul, O Lord, with Thy presence, and remember not the iniquities and excesses which, through the violence of anger, or the heat of evil passion, he hath at any time committed. For although he hath sinned, he hath not denied the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but hath believed, ...

"Remember not, O Lord, we beseech Thee, the sins of his youth, and his ignorances: but, according to Thy

great mercy, be mindful of him in the brightness of Thy glory. . . . . Let all the Saints and Elect of God, who in this world have suffered torments for the name of Christ, intercede for him, that, loosed from the bonds of the flesh, he may attain unto the glory of the heavenly kingdom, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth forever and ever. Amen."

After reading the discourse after the last supper, and the affecting history of the passion and death of our Saviour, the priest suggests these prayers to the dying man:

"O God, who for the redemption of the world wast willing to be born; circumcised; rejected by the Jews; betrayed by the traitor Judas with a kiss; bound in fetters; led like an innocent lamb to slaughter; and unbecomingly exposed to the sight of Annas, Caiphas, Pilate and Herod; accused by false witnesses, buffeted, spit upon, scourged with stripes, crowned with thorns; struck with a reed, blindfolded, harassed with insults, stripped of thy clothes, nailed to the cross, raised upon the cross, counted amid robbers, given vinegar and gall to drink, and wounded with a lance. Do thou, O Lord, by these most holy pains of Thine, which I, unworthy, recall; and by Thy holy cross and death, free me from the pains of hell, and deign to lead me whither Thou didst lead the thief crucified with Thee; who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God, forever and ever. Amen."

When the dying man draws near his end, then, says the ritual, they that are around him should kneel and redouble the fervor of their prayers. The dying man, if he is able, if not, one that assists him, repeats three times, JESUS! JESUS! JESUS! He adds, or they add for him: "Lord, I commend my spirit into Thy hands. Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!—Holy Mary, pray for me!—Mary, mother of grace, mother of mercy! do thou protect me from the enemy, and receive me at the hour of death!"

And when the soul is departed the minister of Jesus Christ cries out: "Come to his assistance, ye Saints of God; come forth to meet him, ye Angels of the Lord, receiving his soul, offering it in the sight of the Most High. May Christ receive thee, who hath called thee, and may the Angels conduct thee to Abraham's bosom.—May the angels of God receive his soul, and present it before the Most High.—Give unto him, O Lord, everlasting rest; and let perpetual light shine upon him!—May the angels. . . . . "

To Thee, O Lord, we commend the soul of Thy servant, N, that being dead to the world he may live to Thee; and the sins he hath committed, through the frailty of his mortal nature, do Thou, in Thy most merciful goodness, forgive and wash away; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Meanwhile the passing bell calls on the faithful to pray for the departed. His body, arranged in a seemly posture, is surrounded by lighted tapers; a little cross, placed in his hands rests upon his breast; from time to time holy water is sprinkled on him; he is incensed, as a sacred object reserved for the resurrection—as the temple of the Holy Ghost, ready soon to be built up again. Till the time of interment, they who are present, priests or laymen, pray for his soul.[1] The blood of the divine Victim offered on the altar flows for it, to purify it more and more! * * *

In concluding this account which we have very much abridged, we cannot refrain from exclaiming with a prophet: "Let me die the death of the just! let my last end be like theirs!"

III.

Benefits of Extreme Unction.

These details render any long reflections on the benefits of Extreme Unction unnecessary.

[1] Rituale Romanum. *Ordo commendationis, In exspiratione.*

The minister of this sacrament, in the attention which he devotes to the sick, exercises the virtues of patience, charity, self-devotion, and sometimes of intrepidity and resolution. He is abundantly recompensed by the affection and gratitude of the afflicted, whom he assists, and by the salutary lessons which he daily receives at the bedside of the dying. There he sees what youth, health, fortune, honors, pleasures, become under the scythe of death. Thanks be to God, the Catholic clergy have always shown themselves equal to their glorious mission; and the seasons of epidemics and of death have ever been the means of distinguishing the good and legitimate pastors from the hirelings.

The family of the dying man claim their share of the attentions and consolations which are poured forth by the minister of mercy. He has received the most secret confidences of the departing christian, he knows his intentions and his last wishes. Sometimes he brings back the wandering prodigal to the bedside of his dying father; often at that decisive moment he will obtain reconciliations, retractions, restitutions, hitherto waited for in vain. Sacred promises will be the condition of the pardon granted by the dying man, and of that which he himself obtains. At that moment brotherly admonitions may be given with advantage: some one must adopt the orphans left without resource and without support: the family changes its position, and the good pastor is called on to preside over the new institution, which it is about to receive. Every day, the assistance given by the priest to the dying, brings about some of these happy results. Before breathing his last sigh, Jesus entrusts His Mother to St. John, who adopts her as his own. Oftentimes, by the bedside of the dying, is the priest called on to fulfill the office of the beloved disciple.

But, after all, the most important of the advantages conferred by Extreme Unction are for the sick, who receive it; for the benefit of their bodies and their souls.

The body, born down by sickness, obtains relief: The patient, oppressed by the weight of his sufferings, finds them alleviated; as the Apostle says: *Alleviabit eum Dominus.* In some cases health is even restored, if its restoration is conducive to the salvation of the dying.[1] This is taught in express terms by the Council.

"Though it is rarely found," says Estius, "that a man who is dangerously ill is restored to perfect health by Extreme Unction, still it often happens. that he experiences a sensible improvement, which is in many respects useful for the salvation of his soul."[2]

On this subject Bellarmine remarks, that the last sacraments do not produce their salutary effect on the body of the sick man, unless they are administered at a seasonable time. If you wait to call in the priest till the physician has lost all hope and the dying man all consciousness, you tempt God by asking Him to perform miracles, which he never promised; you disappoint the sick man, you deceive the Church, you frustrate the beneficent provisions of Christ's infinite love.[3]

The needs of the soul are still more urgent than those of the body: to be purified from the last stains which still attach to it, to be strengthened against the assaults of hell, then more violent than ever, to be led on to offer the sacrifice of his life in union with Jesus dying; these are especially the succors the soul asks for, and such are the graces which Extreme Unction affords it. "If the sick man is still in sins," says St. James, "they shall be forgiven him." The Council thus translates the thought of the Apostle;[4] the anointing "cleanses away sins, if

[1] Sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi animæ expediat, consequitur. *Conc. Trid.*

[2] *In locum Jacobi:* Infirmatur quis in vobis?

[3] Eo tempore adhibendum est (*sacram. Ext. Unctionis*), cum agrotantibus adhuc integra mens et ratio viget: ut ad uberiorem sacramenti gratiam percipiendam, ipsi etiam suam fidem ac piam animi voluntatem conferre possint dum sacro liniuntur oleo. *Rit. Rom.*

[4] Delicta, si quæ sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit.

there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins."

Thus purified and freed from its debts, the soul receives by the merits of the dying Saviour, what it still needs of patience, resignation, faith and hope, in order that it may die in Him, for Him, and like Him. We can understand the answer of a Protestant minister, to a lady, who had a strong desire to become a Catholic: "Madam, if you wish to live at your ease, continue a Protestant; if you wish to die in peace, become a Catholic." Melancthon gave the same advise to his mother, who asked him what she was to believe in the midst of so many disputes; "continue," he replied, "to believe and to pray as you have hitherto done, without allowing yourself to be disturbed by our controversies."

Finally, the law which makes it the duty of the dying to entrust themselves to the Church at their last breath, is a great benefit to the Church itself; in forming one body ever more and more compact and united. The infant, the very day of his birth, is incorporated by Baptism into the mystical body of Jesus Christ: arrived at the age when reason develops itself, he unites himself still more closely to the Spouse of the Saviour, and thereby to the Saviour Himself and to the Holy Spirit, by receiving the Eucharist and Confirmation: when, arrived at manhood, he enters the married state, he comes again to receive the benediction of his pastor, that his alliance may be a worthy symbol of the union of Christ and His Church: each year by the Easter communion, each Sunday by being present at the holy sacrifice, he ought to give fresh pledges of his unshaken fidelity. But if he is confined to the bed of suffering by long illness; if, removed by journeys, or drawn away by the seductions of the world, repelled, it may be, by the ill condition of his conscience, he has not appeared on the appointed days at the holy table,—alas! examples of these temporary alienations are but too frequent,—then, on the last day, the day

of his departure from this world, what sign of return, what final evidence of obedience shall this prodigal give to God and men? It is at this decisive hour that it is important for the christian to know whether he is dying in peace with the Church his mother, and for the Church to know, whether this one of her children, long alienated from her, returns to die in her bosom. To give this assurance to both, it was necessary, that a last tie should be established to unite the mother to the child, the child to the mother, the penitent to the Saviour, and the dying man to the life of eternity! This helpful tie is Extreme Unction. Owing to it, we daily see a multitude of penitents return like the dying thief, to the foot of the cross. In the eighteenth century nearly all those pretended philosophers, who had sworn "écraser l'infâme," retracted their calumnies before their death, abjured their errors, and begged for grace and pardon from the Crucified of Calvary. Such was the case with La Mettrie, Montesquieu, Dumarsais, Maupertius, Fontenelle, Boulanger, Buffon, the Marquis d'Argens, and many others. Such is the case almost daily with their latest disciples.

Napoleon, one day, addressed these words to one of his faithful generals: "I am happy, General."[1] . . . . It was not after Austerlitz and Jena, after his marriage with Marie Louise, his coronation by the Pope, or the birth of the king of Rome, that the Emperor of the French, the king of Italy spoke thus; it was the captive of England, the prisoner of St. Helena, attacked by a fatal disease, who thus rejoiced in being happy, and happy, not because he was going to die, but,—because he had just received Extreme Unction. "I am happy, General, that I have fulfilled my duties . . . I wish you, at your death, the same happiness. I had need of it . . . Have an altar prepared in the adjoining room: let the holy Sacrament be exposed on it, and the prayers of the Forty Hours be said!"

[1] "Sentiments de Napoléon sur le Christianisme," by the chevalier de Beauterne, ch. ix.

IV.

Errors and Variations of Protestants with regard to Extreme Unction.

Such is the sacrament which the Protestants have not only abandoned, to the great loss of the sick, and the dying, but which they have even most grossly attacked and insulted.

"Never has madness been carried further," says Luther, "than in what they have said about Extreme Unction."[1] To get rid of the testimony of St. James, he denies the authenticity of his Epistle. Yet he tries to find an interpretation of the passage opposed to the Catholic practice. Therefore he says: "Why is there only one priest, when St. James would have several? and again, are they priests, are they not rather *elders*, whom he recommends to be sent for? The anointings practised by the Apostles cured the sick; has not Extreme Unction, with the loss of this gift, lost all its virtue?" In another place he calls it "a useless *greasing*."

Calvin admits the Epistle of St. James; but he turns into derision this grease, with which we "taint bodies that are half dead; that oil which they have warmed up by breathing on it, which they have *bewitched* by long prayers, and saluted by nine genuflexions!!!"[2]

Perhaps the following facts will assist us to discover the true motives of these odious attacks.

In 1543, the plague ravaged Geneva. We read in the registers of the Council of State (of the date of May 1): "That the ministers who had been required to go and visit those that were sick of the plague, excused themselves, confessing that God had not given them the grace of strength and resolution to go to the hospital. It was

[1] Si uspiam deliratum est, hoc loco præcipué deliratum est. *De Captiv. Babyl. De Extr. Onct.*

[2] Institut. l. iv. c. 19, § 21.

therefore resolved that prayers be offered to God, to give them more resolution for the future."[1]

Luther, on a similar occasion had said, that "to give the sacraments to every one, who should approach the holy table, especially at the time of the plague, would be too heavy a burden for the ministers."[2]

Thus it is that "the hireling flees at the sight of the wolf, which comes to destroy the flock, because he is a hireling, and the sheep are not his."[3]

But what becomes of the unhappy victims, that are thus abandoned? Alas! it is only too easy to forecast.

"The pastor who is called to attend the dying," a Protestant Doctor tells us, "must expect to meet with many troubled souls. . . . . Indeed there is no legitimate tranquility which has not been preceded by distress of mind. . . Some who up to that time have believed with a merely intellectual faith, and so only imagined they believed, suddenly discover that they do not believe; they see nothing but a great blank, where hitherto the objects of their pretended faith had floated like phantoms before them: having familiarized themselves with all the truths of religion and employed all its language, they no longer receive any impression from it, even at that moment, when it would be most important to be able to make use of it; in a word, at their last hour, instead of a living faith, they find only a lifeless system. Their condition is worse, than if they had never known the truth."

"Distress of mind carried to its furthest limit," he goes on, "becomes despair . . . into which we see men fall, who, having accepted and habitually used the means of salvation, in such measure as they were offered them, having done all, as it might seem, that was necessary for securing their peace, see their faith fall to the ground like a crea-

[1] Life of Calvin, by M. Audin, vol. ii. p. 17.
[2] Life of Calvin, by M. Audin, vol. ii. p. 17.
[3] Joan. x. 13.
[4] *Theologie pastorale* of Vinet, Part iii, ch. 2. § 3.

rion of the imagination, and come to ask themselves, whether all this life, so real, so intimately one with them, so serious and earnest, which they had found in religion, was after all only a dream, and if that Christianity, which holds so large a place in history, has no reality out of history! There are also men who, without losing anything of their conviction, find themselves punished, by sudden and deep despair, for the spiritual pride to which they had abandoned themselves; nay, this mysterious trial has more than once been inflicted on the humblest and most pious faith."

As the sole remedy for this fearful state of desertion, what does our Professor of Pastoral Theology propose? The pastor's visit? But will he go without being sent for? "To this question," says he, "authors give different answers." — Confession? "A formal interrogatory is scarcely possible, it promises very little fruit, and rather closes than opens the heart."—Communion? "It ought not to be given to the sick, except when it is desired, and care should be taken that no superstition enters into this desire, nor should the desire be gratified, except when it is certainly spiritual."

What means remains then for the pretended pastor? The reading of some prayers, and then discourses . . . discourses of which the subject ought especially to be "the necessity of forgiveness; . . . and the assurance of forgiveness . . . the removing of every other way of salvation; prayer opening heaven to the sinner, but to the sinner who prays as a sinner, &c." To all this, what is the ordinary response of the dying person? We may infer it from this singular remark of M. Vinet in speaking of the dispositions of the poor sufferer: "Silence," he says, "even the most obstinate silence, proves nothing" (either for or against him).

Catholic priests are not of this opinion; but they have to deal with sick people of very different dispositions, and they bring them words and assistance of a very different kind.

The Council of Trent expresses itself thus on the subject of Extreme Unction.

V.

FOURTEENTH SESSION (*continued.*)

It hath also seemed good to the holy Synod, to subjoin, to the preceding doctrine on penance, the following on the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which by the Fathers was regarded as being the completion, not only of Penance, but also of the whole Christian life, which ought to be a perpetual penance. First, therefore, as regards its institution. It declares and teaches, that our most gracious Redeemer,—who would have His servants at all times provided with salutary remedies against all the weapons of all their enemies,—as, in the other sacraments, He prepared the greatest helps, whereby, during life, Christians may preserve themselves whole from every more grievous spiritual evil, so did He guard the close of life, by the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, as with a most firm defence. For though *our adversary* seeks and seizes opportunities, all our life long, to be able in any way *to devour* our souls; yet is there no time wherein he strains more vehemently all the powers of his craft to ruin us utterly, and, if he can possibly, to make us fall even from trust in the mercy of God, than when he perceives the end of our life to be at hand.

CHAPTER I.

On the Institution of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Now, this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as truly, and properly a sacrament of the new law, insinuated indeed in Mark, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle, and brother of the Lord. *Is any man,* he saith, *sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.*[1] In which words, as the Church has learned from Apostolic tradition, received from hand to hand, he teaches the matter, the form, the proper minister, and the effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church has understood the matter thereof to be oil blessed by a bishop. For the unction very aptly represents the grace of the Holy Ghost, with which the soul of the sick person is invisibly anointed; and furthermore that those words, "By this unction," &c., are the form.

[1] James, v. 14, 15.

CHAPTER II.

On the Effect of thi Sacrament.

Moreover, the thing signified[1] and the effect of this sacrament are explained in these words: "*And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins they shall be forgiven him.* For the thing here signified is the grace of the Holy Ghost; whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; *and raises up* and strengthens the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great confidence in the divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness; and more readily resists the temptations of the devil who *lies in wait for his* heel;[2] and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul.

CHAPTER III.

On the Minister of this Sacrament, and on the time when it ought to be administered.

And now as to prescribing who ought to receive and who ought to administer this sacrament, this also was not obscurely delivered in the words above cited. For it is there also shown, that the proper ministers of this sacrament are the *Presbyters of the Church;* by which name are to be understood, in that place, not the elders by age, or the foremost in dignity among the people; but, either bishops, or priests by bishops rightly ordained *by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood.*[3] It is also declared, that this unction is to be applied to the sick, but to those especially, who lie in such danger as to seem to be about to depart this life; whence also it is called the sacrament of the departing. And if the sick should, after having received this unction, recover, they may again be aided by the succor of this sacrament, when they fall into another like danger of death. Wherefore, they are on no account to be hearkened to, who, against so manifest and clear a sentence[4] of the Apostle James, teach, either that this unction is a human figment or is a rite received from the Fathers, which neither has a command from God, nor a promise of grace; nor those who assert that it has already ceased, as though it were only to be referred to the gift or grace of healing in the primitive church; nor those who say that the rite and usage which the holy Roman Church observes in the administration of this sacrament is repugnant to the sentiment of the Apostle James, and that it is

[1] Res. [2] Genes. iii. 15. [3] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [4] Sententiam.

therefore to be changed into some other: nor finally those who affirm that this Extreme Unction may without sin be contemned by the faithful: for all these things are most manifestly at variance with the clear words of so great an Apostle. Neither assuredly does the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all other churches, observe aught in administering this unction,—as regards those things which constitute the substance of this sacrament,—but what blessed James has prescribed. Nor indeed can there be contempt of so great a sacrament, without a heinous sin, and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself. These are the things which this holy œcumenical Synod professes and teaches and proposes to all the faithful of Christ, to be believed and held, touching the sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction. And It delivers the following canons to be inviolably preserved; and condemns and anathematizes those, who assert what is contrary thereto.

Canons on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sin, nor comfort[1] the sick; but that it has already ceased, as though it were of old only the grace of working cures: let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one saith, that the rite and usage of Extreme Unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is repugnant to the sentiment of the blessed Apostle James, and that it is therefore to be changed, and may, without sin, be contemned by Christians; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one saith, that the *Presbyters of the Church*, whom blessed James exhorts to be brought to anoint the sick, are not the priests who have been ordained by a bishop, but the elders in each community, and that for this cause a priest alone is not the proper minister of Extreme Unction; let him be anathema.

[1] Alleviare, raise up.

CHAPTER SIXTEENTH.

Of the Sacrament of Order.

Session Twenty-third.

I.

Of the Priesthood in general. How by its mere existence it would be sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity.

The priesthood, studied in its history and characteristics, would of itself supply a demonstration of the truth of Christianity.

In fact a priest, as the word has been understood from the first by all people, by Christians, by Jews, nay, even by Pagans, can be explained only through Jesus Christ, the God-Man.

A priest is a mysterious, sacred, inviolable being, divine rather than earthly, separated from the rest of mankind by continence and by the sublime character of his functions, called from on high, consecrated by a heavenly anointing, offering on bloody altars awful but salutary sacrifices, and drawing from his character of sacrificer a supreme authority over other mortals. Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, speak of priesthood as the most important ministry of society. "The well being of all," says Cicero, "is committed to his hands."

This sublime function is reserved for those, who are called to it by our Saviour. "No man takes the honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was."[1] He who intruded himself into the sanctuary without this heavenly calling would be but a thief, and a robber, says the Council of Trent, after the teaching of our Lord. In

[1] Hebr. v. 4.

consequence of their touching holy things without mission, Core was swallowed up alive, Saul rejected from being king, Jeroboam had his hand withered, Ozias was covered with leprosy, Oza struck dead. The service of the ancient temple was committed to the Levites exclusively. Throughout, then, the priesthood is placed above all the gifts of nature, the pretensions of ambition, the prerogatives of temporal power. Melchisedech the priest of the Most High, appeared in the world without parentage, without genealogy, his origin and his end alike unknown. The heathens said that the priest was the offspring of the gods.

This vocation from on high must precede sacerdotal consecration, if grace is to accompany the rite. Of the rite itself the principal parts are the *imposition of hands*, the sign of superior power conferred, then the *anointing* with oil with which is mingled the blood of an immolated victim, and *the delivering of the instruments of sacrifice.* These symbolical acts indicate that the origin and the principal function of the supernatural virtue, which is poured out upon the priest, is a great, mysterious and necessary immolation. Among the Jews and Romans the blood of a victim was mixed with the oil for *the anointing.* A Christian priest could not be consecrated apart from the sacrifice which he offers with the Bishop, and in which he participates. "Under all the laws which have governed mankind," says the Council of Trent, "priesthood and sacrifice have been inseperable." The offices of teacher, pastor, judge, are derived from this first and essential prerogative which belongs to him in all times and places, and which consists in sprinkling an altar with blood, and that blood the most precious and the most pure.

Such has the priest been from the beginning of the world to our own days: a mysterious being related both to heaven and to earth; separated from the rest of mankind by a special vocation; made by consecration the ex-

clusive property of God, receiving from Him supernatural grace and power; whose principal function is to offer sacrifice; and who, by virtue of that sacrifice, saves the world from sin and hell, and after saving it, teaches and guides it on earth and assists it in attaining heaven.

Now by these marks, who will not recognize Jesus Christ the Priest, the high, the chief Priest, in the most special sense, of whom human priesthood is the *sacrament*, that is to say, the sanctifying sign, the representation which lives and is vivified by grace? "Every priest," says the Apostle, "is chosen from among men."[1] This shows Jesus Christ as man like unto us. . . A priest ought to be without blemish, without bodily blemish, among the Jews;[2] without spiritual blemish among Christians. This shows Jesus Christ as the lamb without blemish, without spot.[3] . . The priest is the man *of God*, the minister *of God*, the portion *of God*, the man *called of God*, *consecrated to God*, wholly occupied with *the interests of God;* "he that despiseth him, despiseth *God;* he that hears him hears God: he remits sins as *God*, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored *as God* by himself and by the congregation.— This shows Jesus Christ as God-Man! . . . The priest is not vested with the functions and powers of the priesthood except by a *holy anointing*, whence comes the name of *Christ* (anointed) given Him in the Scriptures. This shows that the Incarnation was for the Saviour an anointing altogether divine, celebrated by the prophets, which causes the name of *Christ* to be added to his name Jesus. . . The priest daily offers a great sacrifice; and the victim which he immolates is the Lamb of God, bearing the sins of the world; and by continence, by Apostolic self-devotion, he ought daily to associate himself with this great immolation. This shows Jesus Christ content to offer Himself as a holocaust upon the altar of the cænacle and on that of the cross, for the salvation of the whole world. . . From the

[1] Hebr. v. 1. [2] Levit. xxi. 17, etc. [3] I Petr. i. 19.

virtue of this sacrifice, which he offers daily, the priest derives the power and the right to teach the faith, to administer the sacraments, to govern souls. It is because Jesus Christ, becoming our Redeemer, by the sovereign efficacy of His sacrifice, is thereby also teacher, pattern, pastor, legislator, supreme judge of all men, the eternal glory of the saints. In one word, the priest, such as he is in the christian system, that is to say, the Catholic priest, presupposes, represents, shows forth Jesus Christ, the God-Man, Jesus Christ as He is known and adored by the whole of Christendom.

The priesthood then is a supernatural institution, charged, from the time He was promised to the world, with representing Christ: with figuring Him and prophesying Him before His coming, with continuing Him, serving as His instrument and organ since His advent; and as human paternity reminds us of the Divine paternity; as the regal office among men shadows forth the sovereignty of God; as the idea of sacrifice is explained by that of sin and expiation, so does the priesthood presuppose and show forth not Christ only, but the whole of Christianity which is summed up therein.

II.

Institution of the Sacrament of Order.

That divine High Priest, some hours before He entered upon the road to Calvary, had assembled His Apostles in the supper-room; and there following the prescriptions of the law, had celebrated the Paschal supper with them. Thus He wished to honor that ancient rite, while He abolished it, as henceforward little suited to be the image of His approaching sacrifice; then He proceeded to institute a more perfect representation of His sacrifice and His priesthood.

In order to prepare for this, the Lord, some time before, chose seventy-two disciples from among those who had

been converted to His law. He had raised the twelve Apostles to a higher position and admitted them to the most intimate familiarity with Him. Among the twelve, He had distinguished *Simon*, whom He had named Peter, because it was on that Rock that He would build His Church. Thus was the hierarchial order established. As though to offer the first honors to it, He prostrates Himself and humbly washes the feet of His Apostles, then having changed the bread into His sacrificed body and the wine into His outpoured blood, He admits them first to participate, by the communion, in that great sacrifice, and gives them the power and the right to offer it themselves, saying: "Do this, which I have done, in commemoration of ME;" and, as St. Paul adds: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come."[1]

"*Do this in commemoration of me.* These six words of our Saviour,—words which have raised up all our temples, erected our altars, supplied spiritual nourishment to innumerable guests at the sacred feast,—require to be brought into connection with some others, addressed at various times by the same great High Priest to the same persons: "As My Father hath sent Me, I also send you.[2] . . . Whatsoever you shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in Heaven.[3] . . . Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.[4] . . . Preach the Gospel to every creature.[5] . . . Behold I am with you always, even to the consummation of the world.[6] . . . Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained,"[7] &c., &c.

All these powers, conferred on a few for the benefit of all, were to endure as long as the human race, and, conse-

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [2] Joan. xx. 21. [3] Matth. xviii. 18.
[4] Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15. [6] Matth. xxviii. 20.
[7] Joan. xx. 23.

quently, were to be regularly transmitted. We find the mode of this transmission in Scripture.

The Apostles, in obedience to the command which they received from the Holy Ghost, separate Paul and Barnabas from the body of the faithful: and after having fasted and prayed, they lay their hands on them, and appropriate them to the work of the ministry.[1] The priest then is a man *separated*, set apart (*segregatus*) from other men, and the imposition of the hands of the Apostle or the Bishop is essential to his consecration. But does this imposition of hands confer grace? St. Paul will tell us. He writes to Timothy: "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, (by the prophetic or sacramental words), with the imposition of the hands of the priesthood;[2] and in a second letter; "I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands."[3]

It was by this method, and conferring the same grace, that St. Paul and St. Barnabas "ordained priests in every church," according to the testimony of St. Luke.[4] The same two Apostles go to Jerusalem to have the question of circumcision decided by "the Apostles and Priests."[5] St. Paul charges Titus to "ordain priests" in the different cities of Crete, meaning by "priests" bishops, as the Apostle himself explains a few verses farther on.[6] In the discourse which he addresses to the *priests* of the churches of Asia, assembled at Miletus, he says to them among other things: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you *bishops*, to rule the church of God.[7] He recommends Timothy not to lay hands lightly (or hastily) on any man."[8]

Thus bishops, raised by the Apostles to the plenitude of the priesthood, by the imposition of hands, are, in St.

[1] Act. xiii. 2, 3. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [3] 2 Tim. i. 6.
[4] Act. xiv. 22. [5] Act. xv. 2. [6] Tit. i. 5 and 7.
[7] Act. xx. 17, 28: Vocavit majores natu: Græce, πρεσβυτέρους: et xxviii.
[8] 1 Tim. v. 22.

Paul's judgment charged by the Holy Ghost with the government of the church.[1] From the beginning, in order to promote the more rapid propagation of the faith, each city had its bishop, or even its bishops, who mutually assisted each other. The Apostles seek to appoint successors to themselves, before appointing any successors to the disciples. The need of another ministry, inferior to that of priests, was felt at an early period. We read the following account in the Acts of the Apostles.[2] On the occasion of some complaints respecting the division of the food at the feasts of charity, which at that time followed the distribution of the Eucharist, the Apostles called together the body of the faithful, and said to them: "It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. . . and they chose Stephen. . . Philip. . . &c. These they set before the Apostles; and they, praying, imposed hands upon them." St. Luke relates how these deacons discharge their ministry: Philip baptizes, Stephen preaches the gospel, performs miracles, &c.[3] St. Polycarp and St. Ignatius, the disciples of the Apostles, call the deacons ministers of Jesus Christ and of His Church.[4] Pope St. Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, says that in instituting the diaconate the Apostles fulfilled the Scriptures.[5] St. Ignatius wrote to the faithful at Smyrna:[6] Follow the bishop, as Jesus Christ does His Father; and the priests as the Apostles, and reverence the deacons as the command of God: *Tanquam Dei mandatum.*"

The same necessity which had occasioned the institution of deacons, gave rise to the inferior orders. Several monuments of the third century attest that all the orders now recognized existed at that period in the Latin

[1] Act. xx. 28. [2] Act. vi. 1, etc. [3] Act. viii and vi.

[4] St. Polycarp. *Epist. ad Philip.* c. 5; St. Ignat. *Epist. ad Tral.* c. 2, and *ad Magn.* c. 6.

[5] c. xlii. [6] c. 8.

Church.[1] According to the statement of Anastasius, Bibliothecarius, Pope Caius ordered, in the year 283, that no "one should be made bishop, who had not previously been porter, reader, exorcist, acolyte, subdeacon, deacon and priest."[2] The Greek Church has no inferior ministry except the *reader* and the *subdeacon*. It is not a matter of faith, that Orders other than the priesthood are sacraments; but the institution of Jesus Christ, the promise of grace and the outward rite evidently belong to the consecration to the priesthood. The Episcopate, according to the belief and the practice of the Church, possesses a superiority over the simple priests. Bishops are considered as the proper successors of the Apostles,[3] as the real heads over the priests and the faithful,[4] as vicars of Jesus Christ,[5] without whose will or authorization nothing can be done in the church.[6]

Aerius, in the fourth century, had the audacity to deny this pre-eminence. The whole church at once rejected him as a heretic, as is attested by St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine. They alleged against him the holy Scriptures, which show us that the Apostles were superior to the disciples, and the unanimous opinion of the Fathers who see in the bishops the successors of the Apostles, in the priests the successors of the disciples. The Apostolic Fathers, and those of the second and third centuries, unanimously recognize the superiority of the priests over the deacons, and of the bishops over the priests.[7] The oldest rituals of the Eastern and Western churches give the same testimony. St. Clement of Alexandria[8] speaks of "the degrees in the

[1] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. vi. c. 43. [2] *De Vitis Rom. Pontif.*

[3] St. Iren. iv. 33, *Clem. Strom.* vi. 13; Tertull. *Præscript*, c. 32; St. Cyprian, *Epist.* lxxv; Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* l. i. c. 1.

[4] Herm. *Past.* l. iii; *Sim.* ix. n. 27; Origen *in Luc. Hom.* xxxiv; St. Cyprian, *De Unitat Eccl.*; Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii.

[5] St. Ignat. *ad Trall.* c. ii. and iii; *ad Symrn.* c. 9; *ad Rom.* c. 9.

[6] St. Ignat. *ad Symrn.* c. 8. *ad Magn.* c. 4.

[7] St. Clem. *Epist.* i. *ad Cor.* c. 40; St. Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* c. 8, and *ad Magn.* c. 6.

[8] *Strom.* l. vi. c. 13.

Church on earth of bishops, priests, and deacons," as imitations of the angelic glory, &c. Origen says: "More is required of me" a priest "than of a deacon; more of a deacon than of a layman; but of him to whom the ecclesiastical authority over us all has been committed, still more is required."[1]

III.

Powers of the Priest.—Obligation to continence imposed on him.

Among all the powers bestowed on the priests of the New Law, we must distinguish two as the principal: one over the natural body of Jesus Christ, the other over his mystical body, the Church.

The word of the priest makes the living body, or rather the humanity of Christ present upon the altar at the very instant it is uttered. It is the priest who guards, dispenses and offers It as a sacrifice. Every day he takes that divine Victim in his hands, offers It to the adoration of the faithful, feeds on It Himself, and gives It as food to others. He encloses It in the solitude of the tabernacle, exposes It on the altar, carries It as the viaticum to the sick, bears It in triumph through the streets; whatever he wishes, as he wishes, so long as he wishes, is done by Jesus Christ with an obedience, a punctuality, a self-abandonment, which both for priest and people are the most perfect pattern of the most entire submission to the divine authority. *Imitate Him whom you touch.*[2]

The power of the priest over the mystical body of Jesus Christ is not less extensive. He causes the children of the Church to be born by Baptism; he feeds her by dispensing the divine word and the Eucharist; he cures her sick members and brings to life those who were dead by applying the divine remedy of Penance; he blesses the nuptial bond; he is the judge, the pastor, the protector, and he ought to be the pattern of the Christians that are

[1] *Hom.* xi *in Hierem.* [2] Pontif. *in ordin. Presbyteri.*

entrusted to his charge; after having purified them from their last stains by Extreme Unction, he gives them the viaticum, the provision for their journey to heaven; if he has received the plenitude of the priesthood in the episcopate, he animates her with the Spirit of God by the imposition of hands; and by conferring Orders and transmitting the powers, himself possesses, the bishop perpetuates among men the Sacrifice, the Priesthood, and as it were, the Mission of Jesus Christ, saying in his turn like the Saviour in the supper-room: "Do this which I have done in commemoration of me . . . As my Father hath sent me, I also send you." In heaven the priest is to be the assessor of Jesus Christ, the judge of the living and the dead, and, if he has been faithful, the inseperable companion of all His joy, for it is written: "Where I am there shall also my minister be."[1]

But Jesus Christ could not entrust so complete a power over His own virginal body and over the Church, His mystical body, except to those on whom His grace has bestowed a power over their own bodies. Can he who is unfaithful in that which is less, be faithful in that which is great? and ought not he who would bring into subjection the passions of others, in the first place be master of his own? *If then you have not been faithful in the unjust mammon, who will trust you in that which is the true?*[2] The priest then, after the example of Jesus Christ, with a view to the glory of God and the salvation of men, ought to make his body a victim of continence, modesty, labor... He ought to esteem himself happy in becoming like God a father "through the Word," and in regenerating the world, like Jesus Christ, by the sacrifice of himself. He ought, everywhere and at all times, to be a living evidence of the power of grace, of the efficacy of faith, and the sanctity of the christian law. Daily fed by the virginal flesh of Jesus Christ, and drinking His blood so generous and so pure, living in the midst of sacred things, the physician of souls

[1] Joan. xii. 26. [2] Luc. xvi. 11.

at the tribunal of Penance, he possesses every means and every motive for leading that perfect life himself, into which he is to introduce elect souls. In this he does but imitate the Apostles; St. Jerome, following Tertullian, says that the Apostles "were either virgin or continent."[1] Origen, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius attest that the practice established from the Apostolic age was, that they who were admitted to the priesthood should renounce all the rights acquired by marriage.* In the second council of Carthage, Bishop Aurelius, in confirming the decree which interdicted bishops, priests and deacons from marriage, said, "What the Apostles taught, what antiquity preserved, let us also maintain."[3] Pope Siricius, in the year 385, urged the execution of this law which he called *Apostolic*, and punished those who transgressed it. St. Innocent I., St. Leo the great did the same. During the fourth and fifth centuries, the Councils of Illiberis, of Turin, of Carthage, of Toledo, &c., insist on the faithful observance of the *ancient* law, attributed to St. Peter. Never has incontinence been unpunished in the Latin Church; on this point it may serve as a pattern to the Eastern, in which the Council in Trullo authorizes priests and deacons, not indeed to contract a profane alliance, "which is still forbidden them, but to enjoy the rights of a marriage contracted before their ordination, only obliging bishops to continence. This permission does not obtain a higher authority for the married priest. He celebrates the holy mysteries only on Sundays and festivals, after passing the previous night in the church; and penitents prefer to make their confession to the religious, who are bound by vows to continence, or to bishops. Often the pastor, the father of a family, in order to provide food for his children, is obliged to adopt some profes-

[1] Vel virgines vel post nuptias continentes.

[2] * See the passages in Waterworth's Faith of Catholics, vol. iii. pp. 230, 231.

[3] Quod Apostoli docuerunt, et ipsa servavit antiquitas, nos quoque custodiamus.

sion, or follow a trade which occupies him the whole week.

How can the priest of Jesus Christ, obliged, in an especial manner to prayer, to study, to intimate communion with God, to the celebration of the holy sacrifice, to alms, to visiting the sick, to instructing the young, to the exercise of zeal, and the propagation of the faith through the whole world, how can he be dispensed from observing a law which the world imposes on military men, or on sailors, on most domestic servants, and on teachers; which Napoleon inserted among the regulations of his University; which almost all religions, even those that are false and idolatrous, professed to make their priests and their vestals observe?

The diminution of the population is alleged as an objection. But is it not the quality rather than the number of living men, which gives glory to the Creator? and, further, statistics prove that nowhere is population more abundant than in countries largely provided with religious institutions, as Belgium and Italy.[1]

Another objection is drawn from political interest. Marriage, they say, would interest the clergy much more in the material progress of their country.—Yes, but on the condition of enslaving the priesthood, of enervating it, of placing it in the most absolute dependance on those who dispense endowments, of making it a sacerdotal caste, taken up with the things of time more than with the great concerns of eternity. But "if the salt lose its savor, it is good for nothing but to be cast out, and trodden under foot."

It has been said that the marriage of ecclesiastics would prevent certain evils.—We reply, with M. de Maistre, that "the indisputable superiority of the Catholic clergy is due above all things to the law of celibacy;" that the best preservative against incontinence is the habit of

[1] The population to the square mile is in Italy, 225; in Belgium, 453. . . . in Prussia, 156; in China, 42. Perrone *de ordine*, n. 230

chastity acquired in youth; that marriage exposes to temptations much more varied and more violent than virginity vowed to God; that, besides, nothing could be more opposed to common sense and the general good, than to suppress a law which is essentially useful under the pretext of preventing infractions of it. This false principle would begin by destroying all legislation respecting marriage, utterly and entirely; in order to prevent adultery, it would permit polygamy, &c.

IV.

Ceremonies of Ordination.

Besides, no one is constrained to bind himself to this life of abnegation and sacrifice in the priesthood; and the bishop takes care to say to the sub-deacons before ordaining them:

"My dearest sons, you that are to be promoted to the holy order of sub-deacons, ought to consider carefully again and again, what that burden is which you are this day desirous to undertake. For up to this time you are free, and it is open to you at your own choice to return to the pursuits of the world; but after receiving these orders you will no longer be free to draw back from your resolutions; you must for ever be the servants of God, whose service is a royal dignity; and it will be your duty, by His help, to preserve chastity, and to be bound for ever to the ministry of the Church. Consider, therefore, while there is time; and if you resolve to persevere in your holy purpose, in the name of God, draw near."

The step is taken: the Levite has renounced the world and himself. At this solemn moment he falls, struck dead, as it were, on the pavement of the temple, and the whole Church militant adjures the Church of heaven to assist him with their intercessions, and humbly entreats the Lord graciously to bless, sanctify and consecrate those, whom He has chosen and who are thus prostrate at His feet.

After certain intervals of time, which have been wisely regulated by the Canons and called *interstices*, the day arrives on which the Levite, who has given to the Church pledges of his future fidelity, is to be promoted to the priesthood.

"Most reverend father," says the archdeacon to the Bishop, "our holy mother, the Catholic Church, calls on you to ordain these deacons here present to the office and duty of the priesthood."

"Do you know that they are worthy of it?" asks the bishop.

"So far as human infirmity allows, I know and testify that they are worthy of the charge of this office."

The bishop says: "Thanks be to God!" and announces these good tidings to the people in the following words:

"Dear brethren, inasmuch as the pilot who guides the vessel and the passengers that are conveyed by it, share alike in security and in fear, they whose interests are common ought to exercise a common judgment. For not without reason did our Fathers ordain that the people should be consulted in the choice of those who are to be admitted to the government of the Church; since the life and conversation of the person, who is to be appointed are sometimes unknown to the great body, while they are known to the few; and it is more easy to be obedient to one after he is ordained, to whose ordination we have ourselves consented. Now the life and conversation of these Deacons, who by God's help are to be ordained priests, are (so far as I know) approved and pleasing to God, and worthy (as I think) of an advance in ecclesiastical dignity. But we must appeal to the judgment of the many, lest one or a few be misled by good nature or deceived by affection. Do you then freely declare what you know of their actions and character, and what you think of their deserts; and give your testimony respecting their fitness for the priesthood, not from any private affection, but according to their merits. If any man has

anything to allege against them, let him come forward boldly on behalf of God and for His sake, and declare it. Let him however remember his own condition."

Here the Bishop pauses; he awaits the answer of the people: if no objection is made he proceeds:

"Dear sons, you who are to be consecrated to the office of the priesthood, be it your earnest endeavor to receive that office worthily, and to discharge it commendably. For it is the duty of a priest to offer the sacrifice, to bless, to rule, to preach and to baptize. We ought then to approach so high a dignity with great awe, and to take care that they, who are chosen thereto, be recommended by heavenly wisdom, irreproachable morals, and long observance of God's commandments. Wherefore, when God commanded Moses to choose seventy men out of all Israel to assist him, on whom He promised to bestow the gifts of the Holy Spirit, He said: "whom thou knowest to be ancients of the people." Now you are represented by these seventy men, the elders, if keeping the ten commandments of the Law by the sevenfold Spirit you shall be blameless and mature alike in knowledge and in conduct. Under the same mystery and the same figure, the Lord in the New Testament chose seventy-two, and sent them two and two before Him to preach the gospel; that He might teach us both by word and action, that the ministers of His Church should be perfect in faith and works: or established on the twofold love of God and their neighbor. Do you therefore study to be such, that by God's grace ye may be worthily chosen to be helpers to Moses and to the twelve Apostles, that is to the Catholic Bishops, who are figured by them. It is by this wonderful variety that holy Church is surrounded, adorned and governed; when some are consecrated as bishops, others as priests of the second order, as deacons and sub-deacons, each in their different rank; and the one body of Christ is made up of many members of different dignity. Wherefore, my dear sons, who have been chosen by the judg-

ment of our brethren to be consecrated as our co-adjutors, preserve in your conduct the integrity of a chaste and holy life. Understand well what you do. Imitate what you handle; that celebrating the mystery of the Lord's death, you may mortify your own members from all vice and concupiscence. Let your teaching be a spiritual medicine for the people of God. Let the perfume of your life be the delight of the Church of Christ; that both by your preaching and your example you may build up the house, that is the family, of God; that we may not merit condemnation for promoting you to so great an office, nor you for receiving it, but that rather both ourselves and you may merit a reward: which God of His great mercy grant."

The Bishop then lays his hands on them, and after him all the priests that are present; and while all have their right hands extended over them the Bishop says:

"Beloved brethren, let us pray to God the Father Almighty, that He would multiply His heavenly gifts upon these His servants, whom He has chosen to the office of the Priesthood; that by His help they may fulfil that which they undertake by His choice, through Christ our Lord."

Then with his hands still extended he chants: "It is truly meet and just, right and salutary, that we should always and in all places, give thanks to thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God, the Author of honors and distributor of all dignities; through whom all things make progress; through whom everything is strengthened, the increase of the rational nature being ever enlarged and improved, in order, fitness and proportion. Hence there is an advance also in the grades of the priesthood, and in the offices of the levites that are instituted by mystic sacraments; so that when Thou hadst appointed the chief priests for ruling Thy people, Thou didst choose men of an inferior order and secondary dignity to be associated with them, and to aid them in their

works. So in the desert Thou didst spread the spirit of Moses by the minds of seventy wise and prudent men, and using them as his coadjutors among the people, he easily governed innumerable multitudes. So also Thou didst transfuse the superabundance of their father's fullness into Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, that the ministry of the priests might be sufficient for the salutary sacrifices and more frequent sacraments. By this provident care, O Lord, Thou didst add the Teachers of the faith as companions to the Apostles of Thy Son, by by whose means they filled the whole world with preachings of secondary authority. Wherefore, we beseech Thee, O Lord, grant these helps to our weakness also, who need them the more in proportion to our greater frailty. Bestow, we beseech Thee, O Almighty Father, on these Thy servants the dignity of the priesthood; renew in their hearts the spirit of holiness; that at Thy hands, O God, they may receive and hold the office of the second dignity, and by the example of their conversation may gently correct the morals of others. Let them be provident cooperators with our order. Let the model of all justice shine forth in them, that when they shall give a good account of the stewardship committed to them, they may obtain the rewards of everlasting blessedness: through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen."

After this sublime prayer the Bishop, sitting, vests each person to be ordained with the stole and the chasuble, saying: "Receive the Lord's yoke; for His yoke is sweet, and His burden light."

"Receive the priestly robe, which is a symbol of charity: for God is able to increase in thee charity and a perfect work."

"Thanks be to God," is the response of the people.

At this moment, which immediately precedes the consecration, they who are present pray with the Bishop, all

kneeling. This is the beautiful prayer which he addresses to Heaven: "O God, the author of all sanctification, whose consecrating is real, whose benediction is plenary; do Thou, O Lord, pour the gift of Thy blessing on these Thy servants, whom we set apart to the honor of the priesthood; that by the gravity of their actions, and the teaching of their lives, they may prove themselves to be elders, formed by the instructions, which Paul gave to Titus and Timothy; that meditating on Thy law day and night, they may believe what they read, teach what they believe, practise what they teach; that they may show forth in themselves justice, constancy, mercifulness, fortitude, and all other virtues, transmit them by their example and confirm them by their admonitions; and keep the gift of their ministry pure and without spot; and by an immaculate benediction may transform the bread and wine offered by the obedience of thy people, into the Body and Blood of Thy Son; and having grown by inviolable charity to the perfect man, to the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ, may, on the day of God's just and eternal judgment, rise again with a pure conscience, a true faith, and full of the Holy Spirit. Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord.

The Divine Spirit is then called down by the solemn chant, *Veni Creator Spiritus* . . . while the clergy and people continue this affecting prayer, the candidate presents himself at the feet of the Bishop, who anoints his hands with the holy oil, saying:

"O Lord, vouchsafe to consecrate and sanctify these hands, by means of this anointing and of our benediction, that what they bless may be blessed; and what they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord."

And placing in his hands the vessels of the sacrifice and the gifts to be consecrated: "Receive the power of offering sacrifice to God, and of celebrating masses, both for the living and the dead. In the name of the Lord."

This divine power is at once exercised. The new priest celebrates the awful mysteries together with the Bishop who consecrates. He communicates with him, while the choir chaunt, as it were to encourage him, those beautiful words of our Saviour to the Apostles: "I will not now call you servants, but friends, for ye know all things that I have wrought among you."

After receiving the Word of God, of which he has become the instrument, the new priest makes a profession of the faith, which he is to preach in all the world, and standing before the altar, in presence of the Bishop, the guardian of doctrine, he repeats the Apostle's Creed.

Then he kneels; and the Bishop, again laying his hands on him, says; "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou remittest, they are remitted unto them, and whose sins thou retainest, they are retained."

All the powers of the priesthood are conferred upon him, the sacerdotal robe is unrolled over his shoulders in its full extent, and the Bishop says: "The Lord clothe thee with the robe of innocence."

Then, taking his hands in his own, because the power of the priest should always be contained in and directed by that of the Bishop, he says:

"Do you promise reverence and obedience to me and my successors?"

"I promise it," says the kneeling priest.

The Bishop embraces him and answers: "The peace of the Lord ever be with thee."

V.

Errors and Variations of Protestants respecting the Sacrament of Order.

This august consecration which makes a Christian a second Christ, had been received by Luther, Zuinglius, Carlstadt, Œcolampadius, Cranmer, and by almost all

the heresiarchs of the sixteenth century, many were even religious persons; Calvin had held two ecclesiastical benefices; Beza had been prior of Longjumeau; and yet we see all these churchmen not only disgrace their character by their works, but with an inconceivable madness delight in degrading themselves officially, and in making their degradation an article of the reformed faith.

Moses had said to the Hebrews in the name of the Lord: "If you will hear My voice, . . you shall be My peculiar possession above all people; . . . . you shall be to Me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation."[1] These words, "*a priestly kingdom*," in Hebrew "*a kingdom of priests*," signify, according to Menochius, "a kingdom which is not laic and profane, but sacred and devoted to my service, a theocratic kingdom." The Chaldee version translates it; "You shall be for me kings (and) priests. "This may signify, you shall furnish me with kings and priests; or, I will honor you as kings and priests; or, lastly, you shall, each of you, have before me the authority of a king and the inviolable sanctity of a priest. Whatsoever sense is given to these conditional words, it is very certain that the Jews were not all kings nor priests; but that in virtue of the divine appointment, the kingdom was to belong to the family of Judah, and the priesthood to that of Aaron.

It was, however, these two words, *regnum sacerdotale*, kingdom of priests, arbitrarily interpreted by the reformers, that served them as a means for destroying first the priesthood, and afterwards the regal power. St. Peter addressed these words, "a kingly priesthood,"[2] to the christian people, and St. John, writing to the seven bishops of Asia, says that "Jesus Christ, the prince of the kings of the earth, hath made us a kingdom and priests to God His Father;"[3] expressions which assuredly did not destroy the right of temporal sovereigns in the Church.

[1] Exod. xix. 5, 6. [2] 1 Petr. ii. 9. [3] Apoc. i. 6.

The priests turned reformers affirmed that these words annihilated their sacerdotal character. According to them, the priesthood,—not the mystical priesthood, improperly so called, which consists in praising God on our own account, and offering ourselves in sacrifice to Him,—but the real priesthood, taking the word in its most rigorous sense, belongs to all christians, men, women, children, idiots, &c. They are all ordained by Baptism, they all have an equal right to perform all holy functions, they can all preach, consecrate the body of Christ, remit sins, &c., &c., . . If all do not exercise this right, it is because, preferring to employ themselves in other occupations, women, for instance, in nursing their children, they commit some of these functions to the sacred ministry. These persons, so long as they exercise these religious functions, are called *ecclesiastics*. They are free to return, when they think proper, into the common body, which they call the *lay priesthood*. Among these ecclesiastics they first of all suppressed, as contrary to the divine law, but afterwards re-established, when they saw it was indispensable to good order, a certain hierarchy, composed of *deacons*, *preachers*, *provosts*, *superintendants*, *general superintendants*, nay in England and formerly in Prussia, high dignitaries, richly endowed, called *bishops* and archbishops. Everywhere, at the head of this hierarchy, the enemies of the Pope, whom they designated as *Antichrist*, placed the king, the queen or the state.

Let us hear what Luther says: "All christians are priests, and all priests are christians. Anathema to him who distinguishes the priest from the simple christian!"[1] "In short," he says in another place, "the sacrament of Order has been and still is a superb machinery, well fitted to produce all the monstrosities, which disfigure the church, to destroy christian brotherhood, to change shepherds into wolves, slaves into tyrants, churchmen into worse than worldly men. So we must oblige all usurpers

[1] *Epist. ad Bœm.* p. 2.

to believe that all baptized persons are priests, and that they have themselves received the ministry, which they exercise only from our consent and by our commission." And he concludes the chapter by revealing to us his design: "If that false sacrament falls to the ground, the Pope's Church, with its characters, will be very near its ruin; we shall see joyful liberty spring up again, and shall understand that we are in every respect *equal*; shall shake off the yoke of tyranny, and come to know that every christian possesses Christ, and that whoever possesses Christ, possesses all that belongs to Christ, and has every power. I shall say still more, and shall speak with still more force, as soon as I know that the little I have said has displeased my friends the papists."[1]

He goes still further, and declares that all those who claim for themselves a visible and outward priesthood in the Church, which distinguishes them from laymen, are nothing but "ministers of Satan and idols of perdition."[2]

In his Table Talk he forgets himself so far as to say that a layman, if called to a cure of souls, is worthily and fitfully consecrated by his marriage, with a consecrated person, that is to say with a Religious.[3]

He is content with still less: he admits all comers to preach the holy gospel . . . "Even if the devil himself should come," he says, "and should be made pastor, I should be forced to admit that his sacraments are valid; for our faith and our sacraments are independent of the person, be that person pious or impious, consecrated or profane, duly called or intruded, be it the devil or his dam."[4]

Œcolampadius,[5] and Zuinglius,[6] followed Luther in this radical reform of the priesthood. Melancthon resisted for a long time. In the profession of faith in twelve articles which he offered to Francis I., we read: "We all

[1] *De Captiv. Babyl. de Ordine.* [2] *De abroganda missa privata.*
[3] Table Talk, f. 389. [4] *De missa privata.* [5] *In* Is. vi.
[6] *Elench. adv. Catabapt.*

unanimously confess that ecclesiastical government is a holy and useful thing. Accordingly we wish that a certain number of bishops should receive authority over the more numerous ministers of the Church, and that the Roman Pontiff should have authority over all the bishops. For there ought to be superiors in the Church, to examine and ordain those who are called to the ministry, to watch over the teaching of the priests, and if there were no bishops, it would be necessary to make them."

Calvin, like Luther, admits the universal priesthood; he interprets like him the words of Moses and of St. Peter.[1] He therefore regards our orders as sacrilegious absurdities, "which," says he, "change horses into asses, and fools into madmen, and make priests the most rapacious, the most stupid, the most licentious race of men in the world; . . . . whose ceremonies have been invented, not by play actors (they put some meaning into their gestures) but by asses." And, notwithstanding, he recognizes in the imposition of hands,[2] a true sacrament, as worthy of that name as Baptism or the Supper, a *faithful symbol of spiritual grace*, but not in the imposition of hands, as we practise it, but as Jesus Christ and His Apostles have recommended it to us, giving the power of preaching the gospel and of governing the church. This sign, instituted by the Holy Ghost, and constantly employed by the Apostles, will not be useless, says Calvin, if we use it without superstition and in conformity with the original intention."

Thanks to all these restrictions, the views of the self-styled ministry of what are called reformed churches, are by no means settled even at this day with regard to the ceremony which they call their ordination. "I believe in my ordination," said a member of the Synod of Lausanne (in 1838). "Fifteen years ago God called me to exercise the ministry in His Church . . . How could I have undertaken this, if I had not received a special mission, if noth-

[1] Inst. l. iv. c. 19. n. 25. [2] Inst. l. iv. c. 3. n. 16, and c. 19. n. 28.

ing distinguished the pastor, if the ministry was only an accident?" On this, another minister replied: "Do not confound *ministers* with priests. Ministers are simple christians, chosen by their brethren, who have acknowledged and empowered them for the discharge of certain functions in the church. You allege in objection to this the imposition of hands received by the ministers, as settling their vocation and conferring on them a character, which distinguishes them from all other christians. I reply that the imposition of hands was only a general sign of blessing, and had no magical character in the primitive church. *A fortiori* it has no such character in our days. And further, have we actually received this imposition of hands? In the solemn ceremony of our ordination, they said, it is true, 'I lay my hands on you,' but they did not in fact lay them on us. An evident proof that this outward act is not regarded as essential. The ceremony of ordination then is only a solemn declaration made in the name of the church, by a body charged with this duty, that those who are ordained are fit to fulfill the duties of pastors, &c." [1]

The Anglican ordinations are nothing else. In vain did the Established Church move heaven and earth to prevent the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England; it must resign itself to the knowledge that in the eyes of all Catholic theologians and doctors it has not had any valid ordinations for a very long time. Let us content ourselves with alleging here the testimony of Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster. "It is my sincere and firm conviction," he says, "that independently of all historical questions, the Anglican ordinations are decidedly null and invalid."

However, in the views of the Oxford school, the Church of Jesus Christ cannot exist without bishops descending in an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. The body and blood of our Saviour can only be given to christ-

[1] *Bulletins de la delegation des classes*, pages 41 and 49.

ians by the hands of the successors of the Apostles, or of those who are delegated by them. The Church can impose the law of celibacy on her ministers, whenever she thinks it well to do so.[1]

The Rationalists explain all these matters much more simply. "The members of the christian community in whom activity predominates," says Schleiermacher, "discharge the ministry on the part of God, among those whose dominant disposition is passivity." The whole mystery of the government of the church then is explained, as soon as we can distinguish the active from the passive. The Darbyites require as the essential condition for the ministry—first, love which impels us to activity, and secondly, the call of God proved by the reception of some of His gifts.

The Anabaptists and the Quakers show themselves more faithful to the principle of the Reformation. From the universal priesthood they deduce as a consequence the universal ministry. "By the grace and power of God," says Barclay, "every one is constituted a true minister of the gospel."

The supreme authority of the State over religious matters is evidently a direct consequence of the universal priesthood. For if all christians are kings and priests, all governments, provided only that they be entrusted to christian hands, may and ought to regard themselves as the directors of the community in religious as well as in civil matters. Notwithstanding the efforts of Beza, Knox, &c., this conclusion was admitted. Everywhere the king, the queen, the council of State, took the place of the Pope. Thomas Erastus, a physician of Heidelberg, made a dogma of this transference of all ecclesiastical power into the hands of the magistrate. Willingly or unwillingly, the church adopted this principle, and quite recently, three thousand two hundred and sixty-two of the Anglican clergy, following the archbishops of Canter-

[1] Tracts for the Times. *Passim.*

bury and York, made a declaration *in favor of the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters*, which they did in opposition to the Synod of Exeter.[1]

In Hegel's view the church is the same thing as the state. In the new confession of faith of the grand duchy of Baden, we read these extraordinary words: "The reformed church acknowledges BY THE SIDE OF JESUS CHRIST (SIC) in her evangelical Sovereign, in the quality of national bishop, the sole ecclesiastical dignity in the State, charged with overlooking, directing and protecting all the external and internal affairs of the national church for the benefit of the State."

The eighteenth of the ecclesiastical ordinances which have replaced the canon law at Geneva says: "If any difference on a point of doctrine arises among the ministers, let them treat together in order to resolve the matter; if this is not sufficient, let them call in the elders to assist them in settling the differences; as a last step, if, owing to the obstinacy of either of the parties, they cannot succeed herein by mutual consent, let the cause be *referred to the magistrate to be settled by him.*"

And the nineteenth: "To obviate all scandals arising from the life and morals of ministers, it will be best that there should be a mode of correcting the said ministers, . . . whereto all, without exception, shall submit" . . . and the first three or four crimes on which the secular arm is to execute justice are (*ordonn.* 21): "heresy, schism, rebellion against order of the church, blasphemy, &c."

A memorial read before the council of state at Geneva, in November, 1837, established, by a multitude of facts, this position, that ever since the Reformation the council of state has uniformly given to the pastors, their *doctrines*, *morals*, *discipline*, and *liturgy*, and that in all that concerns the action of the civil authority on ecclesiastics, the Catholic Church was not placed in the same position as the Protestant religion; the former having two orders of superiors, the bishops and the Holy See, the second having done

[1] December 31, 1851.

away with the papal authority, in order to substitute for it the authority of the civil government.

The national church of the canton Vaud has not been more fortunate. In the synod of Lausanne, a pastor made the following observation: "I do not know whether there has been a tender marriage between the church and the state, but, most certainly, if such marriage has taken place the pastors were not at the wedding." And another made this motion: "I DEMAND URGENTLY THAT WE PROPOSE TO THE COUNCIL OF STATE THAT THE CHURCH SHOULD AT LAST BE SOMETHING!"[1]

Here we see how the arbitrary interpretation of the words, "You are a priestly kingdom," has led the Protestant religious society to have no protection against anarchy other than a government entirely lay, which most frequently is altogether unacquainted with the study of doctrine and the christian law; which is often composed of deists and unbelievers, and might possibly fall into the hands of Jews or of Catholics, reducing it to beg on its knees, but in vain, that the council of State would allow "the church at last to be something!" Here we see how those who did not shrink from applying the name of antichrist to the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome, are compelled by the righteous law of retaliation to submit to the more heavy yoke of a Henry VIII., a Gustavus Vasa, an Elisabeth, of men and women who by their systematic unbelief, their notorious Arianism, their deep hatred of any power superior to their own, are smitten by those anathemas of St. John: "He is antichrist, who denieth the Father and the Son, ... who confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."[2]

And yet Luther, this time inspired as a prophet, had written: "If the temporal power domineered over the church, the devil would soon have nothing to do but to devour the souls of christians."[3]

[1] *Bulletin de la deleg. des classes*, pp. 21 and 24.

[2] 1 Joan. ii. 22. and iv. 3.

[3] Cited by *Dollinger*, t. i. p. 335.

VI.

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION.

HELD JULY 15, 1563.

The true and Catholic doctrine, touching the Sacrament of Order, decreed and published by the holy Synod of Trent, in the seventh session, in condemnation of the errors of our time.

CHAPTER I.

On the institution of the Priesthood of the New Law.

Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible sacrifice of the Eucharist; it must needs also be confessed, that there is, in that Church, a new, visible, and external priesthood, into which the old has been *translated.*[1] And the sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the Apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering His Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and of retaining sins.

CHAPTER II.

On the Seven Orders.

And whereas the ministry of so holy a priesthood is a divine thing; to the end that it might be exercised in a more worthy manner, and with greater veneration, it was suitable that, in the most well-ordered settlement of the church, there should be several and diverse orders of ministers, to minister to the priesthood, by virtue of their office; orders so distributed as that those already marked with the clerical tonsure should ascend through the lesser to the greater orders. For the sacred Scriptures make open mention not only of priests, but also of deacons; and teach, in words the most weighty, what things are especially to be attended to in the Ordination thereof; and, from the very beginning of the church, the names of the following orders, and the ministrations proper to each of them, are known to have been in use; to wit, those of sub-deacon, acolyth, exorcist, lector, and

[1] Hebr. vii. 12.

door-keeper; though these were not of equal rank; for the subdeaconship is classed amongst the greater orders by the Fathers and sacred Councils, wherein also we very often read of the other inferior orders.

CHAPTER III.

That Order is truly and properly a Sacrament.

Whereas, by the testimony of Scripture, by Apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, it is clear that grace is conferred by sacred ordination, which is performed[1] by words and outward signs, no one ought to doubt that Order is truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of holy Church. For the Apostle says: *I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. For God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of sobriety.*"[2]

CHAPTER IV.

On the Ecclesiastical hierarchy, and on Ordination.

But, forasmuch as in the sacrament of Order, as also in Baptism and Confirmation, a character is imprinted, which can neither be effaced nor taken away; the holy Synod with reason condemns the opinion of those, who assert that the priests of the New Testament have only a temporary power; and that those who have once been rightly ordained, can again become laymen, if they do not exercise the ministry of the word of God. And if any one affirm, that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are all mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which is *as an army set in array;*[3] as if, contrary to the doctrine of the blessed Paul, *all were Apostles, all Prophets, all Evangelists, all Pastors, all Doctors.*[4] Wherefore the holy Synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the Apostles, principally belong to this hierarchial order; that they are *placed*, as the same Apostle says, *by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church of God;*[5] that they are superior to priests; administer the sacrament of Confirmation; ordain the ministers of the Church; and that they can perform very many other things; over which functions others of an inferior order have no power.

[1] Perficitur. [2] 2 Tim. i. 6, 7. [3] Cant. vi. 3.
[4] Ephes. vi. 11, 12. [5] Acts xx. 28.

Furthermore, the sacred and holy Synod teacnes, that in the ordination of bishops, priests, and of the other orders, neither the consent, nor vocation, nor authority, whether of the people, or of any civil power or magistrate whatsoever, is required in such wise as that, without this, the ordination is invalid; yea rather doth It decree, that all those who, being only called and instituted by the people, or by the civil power and magistrate, ascend to the exercise of these same ministrations, and those who of their own rashness assume them to themselves, are not not ministers of the church, but are to be looked upon as *thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door.*[1] These are the things which it hath seemed good to the sacred Synod to teach the faithful of Christ, in general terms, touching the sacrament of Order. But It hath resolved to condemn whatsoever things are contrary thereunto, in express and specific canons, in the manner following; in order that all men, with the help of Christ, using the rule of faith, may, in the midst of the darkness of so many errors, more easily be able to recognise and to hold Catholic truth.

Canons on the Sacrament of Order.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood; or, that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins; but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or, that those who do not preach are not priests at all; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and minor, by which as by certain steps, advance is made unto the priesthood;[2] let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one saith, that order, or sacred ordination, is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the the Lord; or, that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or, that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and of the sacraments; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one saith, that, by sacred ordination, the Holy Ghost is not given, and that vainly therefore do the bishops say, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost;* or, that a character is not imprinted[3] by that ordination; or, that he who has once been a priest, can again become a layman; let him be anathema.

[1] Joan. x. 1.
[2] Per quos, velut per gradus quosdam, in sacerdotium tendatur.
[3] Imprimi.

CANON V.—If any one saith, that the sacred unction which the Church uses in holy ordination, is not only not required, but is to be despised and is pernicious, as likewise are the other ceremonies of Order; let him be anathema.

CANON VI.—If any one saith, that, in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordination instituted,[1] consisting of bishops, priests and ministers; let him be anathema.

CANON VII.—If any one saith, that bishops are not superior to priests; or, that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining; or, that the power which they possess, is common to them and to priests; or, that orders conferred by them, without the consent or vocation of the people, or of the secular power, are invalid; or, that those who have neither been rightly[2] ordained, nor sent, by ecclesiastical and canonical power, but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII.—If any one saith, that that the bishops, who are assumed by authority of the Roman Pontiff, are not legitimate and true bishops, but are a human figment; let him be anathema.

[1] Divina ordinatione (ordinance) institutam. [2] Rite.

CHAPTER SEVENTEENTH.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE.

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION.

I.

Christian Marriage, having become the Sign of the Incarnation, and conferring grace, is a Sacrament.

Nothing can be more pure, more holy, more sublime than the Catholic doctrine of Marriage. It is full of wonders, which charm while they astonish us, and it is sufficient to state it in order to show that it is evidently the work of God.

The union of the Word and our human nature, that is, the Incarnation, finds its complement and its ultimate result in the union of Christ and the Church, which constitutes christianity.[1] Accordingly the church is called in our Scriptures the *bride* of the Saviour, nay even *His body*, and the *fulness of His body*.[2] This union of God with man, which, beginning at Nazareth, in the womb of Mary, is to be completed at the right hand of the Father, amid the splendors and the joys of heaven, is wrought out according to the laws which we shall now describe.

The Church, the fruit of the sufferings and death of Jesus, derives her mystic origin from His side opened on the cross, whence sprang forth that water, which gives her birth in the baptismal font, and that blood which supports her life at the Eucharistic table.[3] In order to unite

[1] See this beautiful doctrine developed by P. Martin, *Tract. de Matrimonio.*

[2] Corpus ejus et plenitudo ejus. *Eph.* i. 23.

[3] Ex corde scisso Ecclesia Christo jugata nascitur. *In festo Cordis Christi.*

Himself with her, Jesus says of Himself that He "came forth from the Father."[1] The union is effected by virtue of a mutual consent, announced by the Saviour immediately on His coming into the world, in words preserved by the Apostle,[2] and by Mary, in the name of the human race, in the terms: *Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word.* This consent being given, the Word is made flesh; and thenceforward the Son of God and Son of Mary are no more two, but one. The Word has assumed authority over the human nature derived from Mary, and communicates to it His own personality: *They are no more two, but one flesh.*[3] This alliance which is effected and blessed by God, has for its object the regeneration of humanity, a work which neither human nature alone, for want of merit, nor the Word alone, as being unable to expiate and to satisfy, could accomplish. It follows from this reciprocal gift, that the Word has an absolute dominion over our humanity, and that in Christ our humanity works deeds, human and divine, of infinite value. There results mutual love, most constant and most pure, an intimate association, continual and inseparable. This happy dwelling of Christ with His church produces an unremitting interchange of mutual aid, tending to procure for men a second birth, to nourish them, to bring them up, to protect them, and to provide them with all the means necessary for obtaining eternal life. In this intimate, indissoluble and fruitful society, Jesus Christ is the Head;[4] He acknowledges but one spouse, and the ties which attach Him to His one, His well-beloved, cannot be broken; "What God once assumed," says a theological axiom, "He never abandoned;"[5] "to the consummation of ages He continues united to her, and all the combined powers of hell will never separate Him from her."[6]

[1] Joan. xvi. 28. [2] Hebr. x. 5, *and following.* [3] Matth. xix. 6.
[4] Christus caput est Ecclesiæ, salvator corporis ejus. *Eph.* v. 23.
[5] Quod Deus assumpsit, nunquam dimisit.
[6] Portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam. *Matth.* xvi. 18.

Now, it is on this sacred type of the union of God with man which produces the new birth of humanity, that our Lord established in the New Law the union of man and woman, as the means of generating that same humanity. Such was His design. He willed that grace, which is the divine restoration of nature, should also be its model; and since we are born in order to become christians, He designs that the natural alliance, through which we are born after the flesh, should find its model, its conditions and its laws in the supernatural alliance, through which we are born again after the spirit.

In consequence the spouse of the christian will be that "help like unto Himself," which was taken from the side of Adam, during his mysterious sleep, and of whom he said: "This is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh."[1]

"A man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife."[2] This union shall be made by the mutual consent of the two parties, and the Lord will interpose to give it force and blessing; christian marriage will place the woman under the power and the name of her husband;[3] it will make the two but one generative principle, and will be consummated in a fruitful unity; its end will be to produce a posterity destined to receive eternal life from Jesus Christ; it will be the duty of the christian husband *to love his wife*, as "Christ has loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it;"[4] on her side the wife will be subject to her husband "as the Church is subject to Christ."[5] It will be the duty of both to live together in an intimate and constant society, mutually helping each other, in order to the education and support of their children. They will owe to each other an inviolable fidelity, and this union will not be possible between more than two persons,[6] so that the husband shall never have but one wife, and the wife shall never love but one hus-

[1] Genes. ii. *throughout.*
[2] Genes. ii. 24.
[3] Genes. iii. 16; Ephes. v. 22, 23
[4] Ephes. v. 25.
[5] Ephes. v. 24.
[6] Ephes. v. 31.

band. If death destroy this union, the survivor can, it is true, contract a new one; at the same time, however, these second marriages, as representing less perfectly the union of the Saviour with one church only, without being absolutely forbidden, as the Montanists falsely pretended, will be a stain and an *irregularity.* But during the lifetime of the two married persons, nothing will be able to destroy the bond which unites them; it will be perpetual and indissoluble, as that of the Word and our humanity, which makes one Christ for ever.

Subject to these conditions, Christian Marriage will be venerated in each family as the sacred sign of the Incarnation: but considering that, in order worthily to represent that great mystery, it is vested with a character of sanctity, unity and perpetuity, which may render it burdensome, Jesus Christ has willed that it should confer a grace corresponding to the duties which it imposes. It is a feature of the divine goodness never to impose a burden without giving also the grace which will make it light.

Thus we explain the words of the Apostle by which he sums up the doctrine that we have been developing: "This (union of two persons in the unity of one flesh) is a great sacrament: but I say that it is in Christ and in the church (that this sign has its reality)."[1] And those others which promise grace to the regular fulfilment of the duties of this state: "The wife shall be saved through child-bearing:" *Salvabitur (mulier) per filiorum generationem.*[2]

The sentiments of the Greek and Latin Fathers are found summed up in these few lines of Perrone; "Of the Fathers, some class the marriage of Christians among those sacred things belonging to religion, which ought to be celebrated by the ministers of the church according to a certain rite: such are St. Ignatius, the martyr, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Basil, and among the Latins,

[1] Ephes. v. 22, 23. [2] 1 Tim. ii. 15.

Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. Siricius.[1] Others teach that Christ by His presence at the marriage at Cana had added to marriage a blessing, holiness and grace which it did not before possess. Such is the sentiment of St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine.[2] Lastly, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, &c., call marriage a sacrament.[3] The last named Doctor compares it to ordination and to its indelible character.

Nothing then can be more false than Calvin's assertion, that before St. Gregory no one had recognized marriage among the sacraments.[4] On the contrary marriage is placed among them by all the rituals, by all the sacramentaries written before that epoch. The sects which separated from the Roman church before St. Gregory have the same doctrine as that pontiff on the subject of marriage. The Nestorians, the Copts, the Eutychians, the Jacobites, the Armenians, &c., have at all times regarded it as a sacrament, as their rituals collected by Renaudot, Assemani and others, plainly show.

Accordingly Leibnitz acknowledged a sacrament in marriage, and Marheineke, Myer, Schwartz, &c., have admitted the religious and sanctifying character which tradition attributes to it, according to the institution of Jesus Christ.

Christian Marriage then is the sign of that which is most sacred in our religion, and this sign confers grace in

[1] St. Ignat. *Ep. ad Polycarp.* n. 5; St. Clemens, Alex. *Strom.* l. iii. n. 18; St. Basil, *Hexam. Hom.* vii. n. 5; Tertull. *ad uxorem*, l. ii. n. 9; St. Ambrose Ep. xix. *ad Vigil*, n. 7; St. Siric. Ep. *ad Himer Tarrac.* c. iv.

[2] St. Cyril, l. ii. in Joan. in cap. ii. v. 1; St. Epiph. *Hæres.* li. and lxvii, 3; St. Ambros, *Ep.* xlii. *ad Siricium*, n. 3; St. August, *Tract.* ix, *in Joan.* n. ii.

[3] Tertull. *de Exhort. castit.*, c. v; St. Ambros, l. i. *De Abrah.* c. vii. n. 59; St. Chrys. *Hom.* xx. *in Ep. ad Ephes.*, n. iv; St. Aug. *De Bono conjug.*, c. xviii. n. 21 and cap. xxiv, n. 32.

[4] *Instit.* l. iv. c. 19, n. 34.

virtue of the institution of Jesus Christ; that is to say, it is a *sacrament.*

II.

The properties of Christian Marriage. Impediments arising from the Divine law and the law of the Church. Evils of mixed marriages.

The tie by which this sacrament unites the married is, as we have said, indissoluble. The Jew might, in certain cases, separate from his wife in order to unite himself with another, for his marriage represented the union of the Lord with the Synagogue, which was to be repudiated; but the Christian can never choose another wife in the lifetime of the first, without thereby declaring that Christ has renounced His Church. Divorce is therefore essentially Jewish, and by no means Christian. "Whosoever shall put away his wife," Christ saith,[1] "and marry another, committeth adultery against her, and if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." Again let us listen to the Apostle:[2] "The woman that hath a husband, is bound to the law (which subjects her to her husband) so long as her husband liveth; if she be joined to another man whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free, so that she is not an adulteress if she be married to another man." And in another place:[3] "To them that are married the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband: and if she have departed that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and that the husband put not away his wife." These clear statements explain the meaning of the answer which our Saviour made to the question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" He replies in St. Matthew's gospel: That marriage was by its original institution indissoluble, and that consequently what God had joined together no man should

[1] Marc, x. 11. [2] Rom. vii. 23. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

put asunder.—But they urge an objection, that Moses had in certain cases commanded letters of divorce and separation.—Commanded? No, He replies, "It is true that by reason of the hardness of your hearts he permitted you to divorce your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery." Thus did our Saviour twice declare that Christian Marriage, brought back to its primitive laws, could not be dissolved. From this He concludes in the most general terms, that whoever married a woman put away by another man, became an adulterer: *qui dimissam duxerit mœchatur.* In the case then of the infidelity of the wife He only authorizes the husband to put her away, but by no means to take another: and the meaning of the ninth verse is this: "It is permissible or fitting for a husband to send away a wife when she is unfaithful, but even in that case, if he takes another, he is an adulterer." We have just heard St. Paul say in the same sense: "Let not the wife depart from her husband. And if she have departed, let her remain unmarried." Thus it is that the Fathers and Councils have understood the passage. See especially St. Jerome (letter to Amandus), St. Augustine (de adult. conjugiis), St. Hilary (on St. Matthew), &c.; the Councils of Illiberis, of Arles in 314, of Carthage in 407, of Milevis in 416, etc.

"In that case," His disciples say, "it is better not to marry." Our Saviour does not disapprove of this conclusion: and declares that there are men who for the kingdom of heaven's sake can devote themselves to a life of continence..[1] The Apostle explains himself still more plainly. Speaking on the subject of virginity, he says: "I have no commandment of the Lord: but I give counsel . . I think it is good to be in that state, . . He that is

[1] Matth. xix. 12.

without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. . . And so the unmar ried woman and the virgin thinks of the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit. . . In short; he that marries does well; he that marries not does better. . . And if her husband die, a woman is at liberty to marry another, only in the Lord. But more blessed shall she be, if she remain a widow, according to my counsel."[1] And when he recommends marriage as the means of removing the danger of sin, he explains himself in these very clear terms: "I speak this by indulgence, not by commandment; for I would that all men were even as myself."[2] In another passage he recommends Timothy to maintain the lawfulness of Marriage, against the rising tendencies to the doctrine of the Encratites, who attributed human generation to the devil. At a later period, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Marcion and the Manichees embraced and developed these errors, which consecrated incontinence by proscribing marriage. That state then is lawful and holy, but the state of virginity, preserved in view of the interests of God, is yet more holy and more perfect.

Christian Marriage, being a sacrament, is like all other sacraments, subject to the authority of the Church, which in the interests of morality, and to make the alliance free, well-sorted, prosperous and fruitful, has established certain *impediments*: of which some render the parties unable to contract marriage, and are therefore called *dirimentia*; others called *prohibentia*, which render the marriage not invalid but illicit. When our Lord declared that a man is guilty of adultery who marries a woman, that has been divorced or put away by her husband, he established the impediment of the conjugal *tie*. When the Apostle excommunicated the incestuous Corinthian, who had married his father's widow, he consecrated the impediment of *affinity*. He prepared us for the legislation which makes

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 25. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 6.

difference of religion an impediment, when he declared that the believing person who was molested by an unbelieving husband was free and emancipated. St. Ignatius, the martyr, would have marriages contracted only in conformity with *the judgment of the bishop, de sententia episcopi.*[1] St. Justin and Athenagoras condemned, as adulterous certain marriages which were otherwise permitted by the laws of the empire. The Council of Illiberis and that of Neocesarea, in 314, extended the impediment of *affinity.* That of *public honesty* was established by Pope Siricius. That which arises from a *solemn vow* is mentioned by the Council of Illiberis, the fourth Council of Carthage, the Council of Chalcedon, and the popes St. Siricius and Innocent I. The Councils of Ancyra and Chalcedon speak of the impediment of *violent abduction.* A Council held in Germany, in 916, marks the impediment of *crime.* It is certain then that in virtue of a power specially belonging to her, the Church has at all times interdicted certain alliances, as Moses had done under the ancient law.

She has however used this power with great moderation and wisdom. *Error* as to the person, *constraint, ravishment, insanity, defect of age*, are necessary impediments destined to protect the contracting parties, and to secure to them that amount of reflection and free-will, which they ought to exercise before engaging in a contract on which their future depends.

The *slavery* of one of the parties would prevent him from being dependent, as he ought, on the one who was free. Besides Jesus Christ does not wish to have an enslaved Church for His bride.

Holy orders and a *solemn vow* ought to be impediments, in order that the priest and the religious, having lost all hope of ever contracting a valid marriage, may persevere in their holy vocation and not go and pollute another holy estate by shameful sacriliges.

Difference of religion is an obstacle to an intimate fusion

[1] Epist. *ad Polycarp.* c. v.

of hearts, to the cordial union of the allied families, to the religious bringing up of children. It ought to be an impediment to *invalidating* the marriage (dirimens) between a Christian and an unbaptized person. Between a Catholic and a heretic who is supposed to be near conversion, the impediment is only *prohibitory* (prohibens), that is to say, such a marriage is gravely prohibited by the Church, but as the parties are still able to contract, they are validly married, even when they have not obtained a dispensation. We shall soon have occasion to make some remarks on these *mixed* marriages.

A *clandestine* marriage presupposes want of reflection, imprudence, or real grounds for concealment. It opens the door to a multitude of abuses, it makes it very difficult to prove the fact of the marriage, and consequently the legitimacy of the children. It is an impediment (dirimens), invalidating the marriage in all parishes in which the decree of the Council of Trent on the reformation of marriage has been published.

Certain *crimes*, as adultery with promise of marriage, the murder of one married person by the other, with the complicity of the party coveted for a second marriage, make the criminal incapable of that second marriage, which is necessarily disgraceful and of fatal consequence, when preluded by such attempts.

As to the impediment of *affinity* and of *legal*, *spiritual* or *natural relationship*, the grounds of it are easily perceived: relations and connections live together from their early age; what fearful disorders would result from this unavoidable intercourse, if these might be consecrated at some future day by a legitimate marriage! Besides, it is written: "a man shall leave his father and his mother,"[1] that is to say, his relations, to seek a wife elsewhere; and the experience of all ages is at hand, to prove that the fruitfulness of marriage, the purity and beauty of the

[1] Relinquet homo patrem et matrem suam, et adhærebit uxori suæ. Genes. ii. 24.

blood, require that the wife should really be sought at a distance. There are hereditary vices of the constitution, which are aggravated, when members of the same family intermarry, and are most frequently neutralized, when the husband and wife belong to families entirely unconnected with each other . . . . Finally, it produces greater fusion among different families, a wider distribution of fortunes, properties, &c . .

All these impediments then are grounded on considerations of order, justice, liberty, social economy; they tend to promote the greater good of the family and of the human race. It follows that if for just reasons a christian believes that he ought to ask for a dispensation from any of them, the legislator cannot grant anything lightly; he must weigh the reasons alleged; in case of need he must ascertain their truth by inquiry, not dispense with the observance of a good law except in view of an equal or greater good, and must in all cases put a salutary restraint on those demands of exemption and privilege which tend to destroy the law. It is to indemnify the judges for the costs of these inquiries, consultations, writings, &c., it is to supply by means of alms, the good work which would have been involved in the observance of the law; it is lastly to reduce as much as possible the number of petitioners, and to keep them under the common rule, that persons in opulent or easy circumstances have to pay a sum of money proportioned to their fortune, before obtaining a dispensation from an impediment created by ecclesiastical law. There is always one good way of avoiding charges so justly demanded—that of observing the common rule. The dispensation is granted to the poor at much less expense; *in forma pauperis.*

It follows also that the Church, before blessing a marriage, ought to be assured that no impediment exists. This is the reason of the three-fold publication of the intended marriage, which is made in the assemblies of the faithful, and of the obligation imposed on them to make

known to the pastors the impediments with which they are acquainted.

As already stated, the impediment of *difference of religion* renders an alliance between a Christian and an unbaptized person invalid, the marriage of a Catholic and a baptized person who is not a Catholic unlawful. It is necessary now to show the justice of the law that prohibits these mixed unions.

Mixed marriages in general are disapproved of both by natural and divine law; they are more expressly condemned and prohibited by ecclesiastical law.

Natural law repudiates them, because they ordinarily compromise the faith of the Catholic party, the faith of the children, their piety and affection for their parents, and lead to indifference on the subject of religion. They impair the peace of families, and are hard to reconcile with that christian love, which ought to make the hearts of the husband and wife one, and which is among the principal ends of marriage. They can only cause daily distress to the Catholic party, if strongly attached to the principles of faith.[1]

In mixed marriages the Catholics must follow the narrow road that leads to life, while by their side their partners are walking in the broad way; they are under obligation to abstinence, to fasting, to confession, to communion, practices, which the Protestants consider superstitious and absurd; they must themselves obey the authority of the Church, which they daily see trodden under foot.

I adore Jesus Christ, while the inseparable companion of my life does not acknowledge His divinity; I love to pray to Mary and the saints, and in the eyes of the heretic this is an act of idolatry; I cannot go to church without the thought that in his opinion I am going to a service,

[1] See the work entitled: *Sagesse de la legislation de l'Englise pour assurer la dignite et la saintete du Mariage et reprimer les mariages mixtes,*" by M. Vaurin, Geneva, 1835.

which is vain and rejected by God; I cannot make the sign of the cross without fearing to see an ironical smile upon his lips; . . . And still I am a woman, and, like my mother Eve, I have an excessive fear of ridicule; I am a wife and ought to be supremely anxious for the confidence, the esteem, the entire approval of my husband, I shall be fortunate, if my faith is not impaired; if the spirit of heresy, ever accommodating to nature, does not insinuate itself into my soul; if human respect or the fear of displeasing him, whom I ought to love, does not shut up my religion in the secret chambers of my own heart; I shall be fortunate if the seducing influence of example does not throw me also into the broad way which leads to perdition!

"Assuredly," says Tertullian,[1] "you cannot perform your duties satisfactorily to the Lord, when you have at your side a servant of the devil doing his master's work by hindering the duties and exercises of the faithful; so that, if there is a special service at church, your husband calls you to go with him to the baths; if you have to keep a fast, he fixes that day for a dinner party; when you have to go out on some work of charity, household occupations are then most engaging; while he regards the banquet of the Lord with suspicion and calumny."

"It is written," says St. Ambrose, "with the holy thou wilt be holy, and with the perverse thou wilt be perverted: if this be so in associations of all kinds, is there not much more danger of it in that most intimate union of minds and hearts which we call Marriage?"

"How can there be a sympathy in love," continues the same Father, "where there is a want of sympathy in faith?"[2] That absolute surrender, that complete abandonment of self, which love implies, is inspired by confidence; unity of conviction produces unity of affection and

[1] *Ad uxorem.* lib. ii. c. 5.

[2] Quomodo potest congruere charitas, si discrepet fides? *De Abraham,* lib. i. c. 9.

of sentiments; but when my religious convictions are repudiated, combated, thwarted, how can I give up my heart with entire confidence? When I cannot succeed in making my views adopted on the gravest of all interests, how can I be understood on other points? And do you suppose that I can love with a perfect love in time, when I have no hope of loving and being loved through eternity? When I give myself up for ever, as believing divorce to be impossible and criminal, how would you have me consent that my husband should lend himself only to me, authorized as he is by his religion to forsake me and attach himself to another?

And what will become of the religious education of children under such an anarchy? The child sees his father go to the preaching, and his mother to mass; his father repudiates the teaching of the Church, his mother follows its inspirations; his father treats as idle fables the sacred doctrines which are reverenced as divine by his mother, . . to which of the two shall he attach himself? What one parent labors to build up, the other uses all efforts to destroy. Inclined naturally to submit to the authority of his parents, he sees that authority annulled and annihilated by continual contradictions. What must seem to him, most reasonable, is to suspend his judgment and to delay adopting a religion until he is himself able to discern which is the best . . . The system of Rousseau diametrically opposed to the Catholic!

Do not say that parents can conceal from their children the opposition of their belief. The young have too much penetration to be deceived: they would discern the religious indifference, that was concealed under such dissimulation; and the scandal would only be the greater.

The following lines were written by M. de Stolberg to a young person whom he was endeavoring to dissuade from a mixed marriage:

"Do you know, my child, to what a temptation to apostacy you are about to expose yourself? Are you able

to resolve the doubts which will be proposed to you by learned men? perhaps by Protestants still attached to the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, of whom the number is every day diminishing, or more probably by Protestants, who turn all religion into ridicule and retain no more of their own than they like: unbelievers, of whom the majority regard Jesus Christ merely as a wise man? Will you never feel any false shame, when they see you go to confession, they who regard confession of sins as an ignominious and insupportable yoke? Will you never be disturbed or shaken by the ideas which your husband entertains respecting the sacred mystery, in which the God-man is veiled, and gives Himself, under the most humble outward appearance, to us Catholics? Is it a feeling of satisfaction and tranquillity that you will experience when you reflect that he cannot, by participating in the same sacrament, share with you the blessing whereof our Saviour spoke to St. Thomas: *Blessed are they that have not seen and have believed?* . . . That you cannot, kneeling together before the holy Sacrament, both share in that promise: *I am with you always to the end of the world!* or rejoice mutually in the proper meaning of the assurance that He will ever remain with the successors of the Apostles to preserve His Church from all error? . . . When your husband is attacked by serious illness, and you see death approaching without his being able to receive the sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ—Penance, the Eucharist, Extreme Unction?

"You probably dwell with pleasure on the thought of nursing your little ones, and of seeing a numerous family spring up around you. But before God entrusts you with these children, it will perhaps be necessary, as the condition of your being united to the person of your choice, that you should solemnly promise, that those children shall not be children of the Church, which is the bride of Jesus Christ. Shall you be ready to accept this engagement? to consent to make a promise which would exclude

your sons at least from the Church of God even before their birth ?—a promise which must make the Christian religion suspected by children, who are destined by the marriage contract to be brought up in different religions.[1]

"And he who demands such a sacrifice from you, does not pledge himself to be your husband for ever. His religion authorizes him to forsake you in order to contract ties which Jesus Christ declares to be adulterous. And this husband who lends himself to you, while you give yourself to him, is either without religion, and then he leaves you without security for his fidelity: or he is attached to his false worship, and in that case he will soon repent of having married you; but whether he be indifferent or zealous he will always try to make you adopt his principles, and in the second supposition he will do it out of regard for his children.

"In a word, you will either continue thoughtless, as you are at present, and then what dangers threaten you: or your eyes will be opened to your real position, and you will be every day more distressed at seeing yourself separated, in what is of the highest importance, from your own children, whom you will have excluded from the Church, the mother of all the faithful, whom you will have sacrificed to what you know to be error, and perhaps to everlasting damnation."

[1] A table of simultaneous religious instruction has been drawn up for the use of those unhappy mothers who have consented to such a detestable division. Here are some specimens of it. The Catholic children read the left, the Protestant, the right hand side:

Q. Which is the true Church of Christ?	
A. The Catholic and not the reformed church.	A. The reformed and not the Catholic church.
Q. Is Jesus Christ in the Eucharist?	
A. He is there in reality, not in figure.	A. He is there in figure, not in reality.
Q. Can a person be saved out of the Catholic Church?	
A. No.	A. Yes.
Q. Is the Catholic Church infallible?	
A. Yes.	A. No.

As a general principle, then, mixed marriages are opposed to natural right; they are most commonly contrary to the divine law. We read in the book of Deuteronomy: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them (the seven proscribed nations); thou shalt not give thy daughter to his son, nor take his daughter for thy son," Why? "For she will turn away thy son from following me."[1] The danger of perversion is the ground of interdiction: now this danger is almost inseparable from marriages which are not blessed by a common religion.

And when the Apostle orders us to "avoid a man that continues a heretic, after the first and second admonition,"[2] when he commands that marriage should be contracted only in the Lord, "*in Domino*,"[3] is it not evident that he interdicts Christians, as Moses had interdicted the Jews, from all marriages prejudicial to the interests of faith?

The prohibitions of such marriages by the Church are numerous, and go up to the first ages: "No one ought to be united in marriage to a heretic, a Jew, or a pagan," says the Council of Chalcedon,[4] "unless the party that is not a Catholic consent to come over to the true faith."

And the Council of Laodicea:[5] "It is not allowable to celebrate marriage with any heretics whatever, nor to give them our sons or daughters; if however they promise to become christians they may be received into union with Catholics."

St. Leo the Great, Boniface V., Stephen IV., Nicholas I., Boniface VIII., Clement VIII., Urban VIII., Clement XI., Benedict XIV., Pius VI., Pius VIII., and Gregory XVI., in his allocution of December 10, 1837, have successively condemned mixed marriages.[6]

[1] Neque sociabis cum eis conjugia. Filiam tuam non dabis filio ejus, nec filiam illius accipies filio tuo, quia seducet filium tuum ne sequatur me. *Deuter.* vii. 3.

[2] Hæreticum hominem devita. *Ad Tit.* iii. 10.

[3] Cui vult nubat, tantum in Domino. *I Cor.* vii. 39.

[4] Act. xv. c. 14. [5] C. 31. [6] See Roskovany, *de matrim. mixtis.*

III.

Ceremonies of the Sacrament of Marriage.

In order to be assured that no impediment of this kind, or any other, stands in the way of the benediction of a proposed marriage, the pastor ought to publish during mass on three consecutive Sundays, the *promise of marriage*.

It is also fitting that this sacrament be administered in the Church, in presence of the holy altars.

The affianced persons prepare to receive it by the confession of their sins, which is usually followed by receiving the holy Eucharist. They ought to be reminded of the counsels which the Angel Raphael addressed to Tobias and Sara, exhorting them to be united and to live together as worthy children of God and of the saints; but does not the Lord demand still more of the privileged children of the Church and of Jesus Christ?

When they are come to the foot of the altar, with the witnesses whom they have chosen, and the relations who accompany them, the pastor, wearing a surplice and a white stole, comes to them and requires from each the formal expression of their consent, in these words:[1]

"*N.*, wilt thou take *N.* here present for thy lawful wife according to the rite of our holy mother the Church?"

R. "I will."

"*N.*, wilt thou take *N.* here present for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy mother the Church?"

R. "I will."

The priest then bids them join their right hands, and blessing them, says:

"I join you together in marriage, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

A ring, worn on the finger, will serve as a remembrance of this alliance, contracted in the presence of God; the Church has prayers to bless it; she says: "Bless, O Lord,

[1] *Rituale Rom.* Ritus celebrandi matrimonii sacramentum.

this ring, which we bless in thy name, that she who shall wear it, keeping true faith unto her spouse, may abide in thy peace and will, and ever live in mutual charity. Through Christ our Lord."

To call down a more abundant blessing on the newly married pair, the divine sacrifice is offered for them. The blood of the Lamb without spot cements their union. The Church reminds them of their respective duties, in these words of the Epistle to the Ephesians:[1]

"Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord; because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the Saviour of His body. Therefore, as the church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives, as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the church. Because we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ, and in the church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself; and let the wife fear her husband."

The gospel relates how the Pharisees, with the intention of tempting Jesus, came and said to Him: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? Jesus answering, said to them: Have ye not read that He who made man from the beginning, made them male

[1] *Missal Rom.* Missa pro sponso et sponsa.

and female? And He said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

After the consecration and the Lord's Prayer, the celebrant turns towards the newly married persons and prays over them:

"Be propitious, O Lord, unto our supplications, and graciously assist thine own institution which Thou hast ordained for the propagation of mankind; that the union made by Thy appointment may be preserved by Thy aid. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

"O God, who by the might of Thy power didst create all things out of nothing; who, when the beginnings of the universe were set in order, and man was made to the image of God, didst ordain the inseparable assistance of woman, in such wise that Thou gavest beginning to her body out of the flesh of man, teaching thereby that what it had pleased Thee should be formed of one, it should never be lawful to put asunder; O God, who hast consecrated the bond of matrimony by such an excellent mystery, that in the covenant of marriage Thou would signify the sacrament of Christ and his church; O God, by whom woman is joined to man, and society, as ordained from the beginning, is furnished with a blessing, which alone was not removed, either in punishment of original sin, or by the sentence of the deluge; look mercifully upon this this Thy handmaid, who, being now to be joined in wedlock, earnestly desires to be fortified with Thy protection. May it be to her a yoke of love and peace; may she marry in Christ, faithful and chaste, and be an imitator of holy women. May she be amiable to her husband, like Rachel; wise, like Rebecca; long-lived and faithful like Sarah. May the author of sin have no share in any of her actions. May she remain constant to the faith and commandments: united to one spouse, may she fly all

unlawful approaches: may she protect her weakness by the strength of discipline. May she be grave in bashfulness, venerable in modesty, learned in heavenly doctrine. May she be fruitful in offspring, approved and innocent; and may she arrive at the repose of the blessed in the heavenly kingdom; and may they both see their children's children, even to the third and fourth generation, and arrive at their desired old age. Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

A few moments after, the married persons are incorporated into Jesus Christ by the communion: they become one flesh and one blood with the Son of God and of Mary, one heart with the pure, the loving, the faithful Heart of Jesus! And this delightful and sanctifying union of our humanity with the Divine Word, is the model to which the union just contracted, should endeavor to become every day more like, while at the same time it is the inexhaustible source of the graces which are able to make that resemblance perfect. Christian husbands and wives, do not forget this!

The divine mysteries conclude with this benediction.

"May the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, be with you, and may He fulfil His blessing upon you; that you may see your children's children unto the third and fourth generation; and may afterwards have everlasting life, without end, by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth God, world without end. Amen."

IV.

Marriage submitted to the pretended Reformation.

We have laid before you the doctrine, the discipline, the rites of Catholic Marriage. It will now be easy to know where to find the real *reformation* of that great and holy institution called by the Apostle *a great sacrament.*

On the one side there is the Council of Trent, which devotes itself to protecting the freedom, and consecrating the unity, sanctity, indissolubility of the conjugal bond; which prescribes, under pain of nullity, the publicity of this religious contract that the Church ought to bless, and the existence of which cannot without incalculable evil remain concealed; which recommends all who receive this sacrament to prepare themselves for it by Penance and Eucharistic communion.

On the other side, there are I know not how many priests and monks, engaged, notwithstanding their vows, notwithstanding the ecclesiastic and civil legislation, which had been in vigor for ages in Europe, notwithstanding that other principle of law which forbids any magistrate to be judge in his own cause, engaged, I say, in the bonds of a sacrilegious concubinage; and a few libidinous princes who purchased the right of divorce and polygamy at the price of the spoils of the church; and a few families of importance, led to separate from Rome, because Rome could not approve the scandal of certain unions against which nature protests and which dishonor them before the Church.

And all these persons, in order to *reform* Christian Marriage, that is, in order to give it a more perfect *form*, begin by stripping it of the character of a sacrament, which the Waldenses and the Hussites had respected, and thereby robbing it of all its sanctity and all its glory; its characteristic, so noble and so pure, of being a sign of the Incarnation, and the promise of grace which in that character is attached to it.[1]

The same false and reprobate relations which they suppose between Jesus Christ and all their sects, they establish between the husband and the wife. Just as, according to them, the Saviour would have repudiated the

[1] This, however, does not prevent M. Vinet from having a discourse on marriage, considered as *a sign of the union of Christ and the Church*, which he had to deliver at a *nuptial benediction*.

Catholic Church in order to ally Himself to their Reformation, so, by means of a divorce, the Protestant husband is able to break the bonds of his first union in order to form new ones. Just as in their system Jesus Christ would have allied Himself to communions the most opposed, so the Landgrave of Hesse, the Chancellor of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar, and every Christian who was eager to follow the example of the patriarchs, would have a right to have several wives at once.

In their eyes marriage is nothing more than a function of nature, a state of life which Calvin compares to those of the farmer, the architect, the tailor and the barber. Luther makes it a more imperious necessity than eating and drinking, and to wish to combat this is to contend against the thunderbolt and to make war on God.[1] He compares the vow of continence to an engagement taken by a madman to become the mother of God, to create the heavens, or to bite his own nose.[2] But it is rather continence itself which he declares to be impossible. He writes to the Archbishop of Mayence: "So long as God does not work a miracle, so long as He does not change man into an angel, man cannot remain alone and without a wife, without incurring the disgrace of God." "We are come to this point," wrote Matthias Schenck, rector at Augsburg, in 1571, "that chastity is regarded as impossible."[2]

And very soon one wife is not enough. The head of the reformed religion becomes envious of Mahomet! It is not his fault that the Christian union is not, in the way of reformation, replaced by polygamy. Luther preaches

[1] *De vita matrimoniali, passim.* In his discourse on marriage, delivered in the church of Wittemberg, in 1522, he says: Tam est necessarium (mihi crescere et multiplicari) quam ut masculus sim, magisque necessarium quam edere, bibere, purgare, mucum emungere, somno et obsonüs intentum esse. Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursus ut in tua manu non est, ut fæmina non sis, nec in te est, ut absque viro degas, etc. See Audin, *Hist. de Luther*, l. ii. c. 15.

[2] See "*the Reformation*," by Dollinger, t. ii. n. 15. Influence of the Reformation on the conduct of the people in the relation of the sexes.

that according to the example of the great king of Assyria, every husband who was not satisfied with his wife, could substitute Esther for Vashti, and the servant in place of the mistress![1] He is pleased to observe that Solomon after having had a hundred, nay a thousand wives, died without any expression of penitence, and nevertheless *slept with his fathers*, which, says he, signifies that he was received to blessedness, for such is the meaning of this expression, which the Scripture has not applied to Jacob, the father of the Hebrew people![2] He wrote to the Chancellor of the duke of Saxe-Weimar: "The Scripture prevents me from forbidding any one to take several wives at the same time: IT IS A COMMENDABLE PRACTICE; but I would not be the first to introduce it among christians." Notwithstanding, on the 15th of December, 1539, a consultation in twenty-four articles, signed by Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Corvinus, Lenning, Wintfert and Melancthon, authorized the landgrave of Hesse to take a second wife in addition to the first, by whom he had already had eight children, and from whom he did not intend to separate. In return, Philip promised to grant Luther, and Melancthon all the monastic or other property they should demand . . . *Sive monasteriorum bona, sive alia!*[3] Following, Luther, Bucer[4] and Melancthon, who believed polygamy to be permitted to christians in certain cases; of Carlstadt, who maintained this position at Orlemund in 1524, we see others throw themselves into the same line, such as the apostate capuchin Ochin, who established the sect of the *Polygamists*, and the notorious

[1] Reperiuntur . . . . pertinaces uxores . . . . quibus opportunum est ut maritus dicat, "Si tu nolueris, alia volet." Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla. . . . Si (iterum et tertio admonita) renuat, repudia eam et in vicem Vasthi Esther surroga, Assurei regis exemplo. *Discourse, cited above.*

[2] Table Talk, *On Polygamy*. See also his explanation of Genes. c. 6.

[3] See this authentic piece in Bossuet's *Variations*, l. vi. at the end.

[4] The ex-Dominican Bucer married a Religious by whom he had thirteen children.

John Lyserus, who in his book entitled "*The triumph of Polygamy*," teaches that it is frequently commanded. At the present day the *Mormons* show themselves very ready to obey that command, and to observe it like true Mahomedans. Their present head, Brigham Young, has seventy-five concubines. The *Perfectionists* preach the community of wives and practice it in their great phalanstery at Oneida. The Skaneateles, another body of sectaries widely spread in the State of New York, keep only one wife at a time, but change them at will: the formula they make use of is remarkable. The future husband and wife say in turn: "In presence of all here assembled, I take N. N. in marriage; not making any promise to continue my affection to her, and not praying for any grace to enable me to do so, but hoping, trusting and believing that our dispositions are sufficiently suited to each other, to enable us to be a faithful and affectionate husband and wife to each other during the course of our life." [1]

You see that the reformation of marriage is in progress in the United States. In Europe the Protestants have only arrived at divorce. The power of marrying again during the lifetime of the first wife was granted by Luther and Calvin in a number of cases, which the former wished to reduce to four, but which soon rose up to thirteen.[2] Lindanus cites the case of a man who married three

[1] *Univers.* April 21, 1852.

[2] The 145th ecclesiastical ordinance of Geneva is to this effect: "If the husband accuses his wife of adultery, and proves her guilt by sufficient witnesses or proofs, demanding to be separated from her, let it be granted him. And in case she absents herself, let letter of Proclamation be granted him, and in default of her appearing and justifying herself from the complaint of her aforesaid husband, let him have the liberty to separate from her, if he persist in his request." The 151st supposes a man alienated from his wife "through debauchery or wrong affection." "Let her wait three years," it says, "recommending herself to God. When this term is passed, she can come to the consistory, and if it is ascertained that she has need to marry (the husband not appearing), let the liberty to do so be given her."

times in the space of six months, his first two wives having been convicted of adultery.[1] "The favorite occupation of the evangelicals," says Wizel, "is to pronounce divorces." "Never were separations and divorces so common as in our day," says Wenfeld.

In the United States ten thousand individuals acquire every year the right of living in legal adultery.[2]

We read in the New York Tribune: "There are more than thirty causes of divorce recognized by the statutes of our different States. South Carolina is the only State, in which divorce is not recognized by the law. Virginia admits three causes: impotence, natural or accidental, at the time of marriage, idiotcy and bigamy. Alabama recognizes as a cause of divorce, adultery and two years' abandonment. In Rhode Island the grounds are: impotence, adultery, extreme cruelty, culpable abandonment for five years, habitual drunkenness, refusal on the part of the husband to provide for the support of his wife. In New Jersey divorce is granted in case of previous marriage, of adultery and voluntary absence during five years. In Vermont the causes are: defect of age, mental incapacity, impotence, fraud or violence used to obtain the consent of either of the parties, adultery, imprison-

[1] "Matrimonial affairs are carried on in so unworthy a way, in some of our towns, as all the world knows, that the Jews and heathens themselves would be scandalized by it. The Lutheran pastors have managed so well that at the present day laymen are uot afraid to constitute themselve judges in these affairs, and to pronounce sentences of separation and of divorce. Some shameless fellows recently presented themselves before the burgomaster of a certain town, and said to him, one after another: 'Mr. Burgomaster, I have been guilty of adultery, have the goodness to permit me to be divorced from my wife, and to take another;' and what they asked was granted; and it is said that certain individuals have been married three times during the life of their first wife. And what is practised by the husbands, is practised no less by the wives; as soon as they are tired of their husbands, they go and establish themselves in a Protestant town, and there marry again. This is what they call living as evangelicals." (Leib, prior of Rebdorf, cited by Dollinger, l. ii. p. 430.)

[2] The *Univers.* cited above.

ment for three years or more, ill treatment, desertion for three years, absence for seven years without news, refusal to provide for the support of the wife. In Maine, divorce is obtained for adultery, impotence, desertion for five years, affiliation to the sect of the *Shaking Quakers*, five years' imprisonment, fraud used to obtain consent, habitual drunkenness during three years. Marriage with a negro or a mulatto is declared null and void, and condemnation for felony involves full right to divorce. In Kentucky and Missouri the causes are very nearly the same; but Iowa adds: "Divorce may be pronounced when the married persons cannot live in peace, and when their welfare requires a separation." The law of Arkansas is the same as that of Missouri, with the exception that a year's absence is sufficient to free the deserted party from the bonds of marriage." We see that Protestant America will soon find more pretexts for breaking a marriage than reasons for making it indissoluble.[1]

In the year 1853, 856 divorces were pronounced in the single city of Berlin. In England, from January 1st, 1858, to July 30th, 1861, 781 suits had been commenced on the ground of adultery, 248 on that of ill treatment or abandonment.

Several impediments (to marriage) were suppressed by the self-styled Reformers, others lessened. The impediments resulting from spiritual relationship, legal relationship, crime, pre-contract, were abolished or passed over in silence. On the subject of difference of religion, Luther wrote: "If it is allowable for me to trade with a heathen, a Turk, or a heretic, why may I not marry one? A heathen, male or female, is still a man or woman, beautiful and created by God, just as much as St. Peter, St. Paul or St. Lucy."[2] In a letter to the knights of the Teutonic order, he explained his views on the impediment arising from a solemn vow in the following terms: "Though I should have made a thousand vows, though

[1] *Univers.* March 29, 1859.

[2] De vita matrimoniali.

a hundred thousand Angels, to say nothing of that miserable being whom they call the Pope, should tell me that I ought to remain without a helpmate, that it is good that I should be alone, what weight would those vows and those angelic commands have in comparison with those words of God: *It is not good for a man to be alone*?" And in another place: "These words, 'Increase and multiply,' are a thunderbolt for the Pope's law, and grant all priests, monks and nuns permission to marry." The impediments of relationship and affinity were brought down to such a point, that on the report of Luther himself, the marriage of a certain individual with a woman who was at the same time his daughter and his sister was declared valid, after mature deliberation, by the reformers of the time.

To set the seal of their example to these fine doctrines most of them made haste to marry. Carlstadt was the first to add these new ties to those of the priesthood. His disciples composed prayers for the mass of his marriage, of which the first was in these words: "O God, who dissipating the extreme blindness of thy priests, has vouchsafed to grant to the blessed Carlstadt the grace of being the first that has dared to take a wife, without regarding the laws of popery, we present thee, &c." The circumstances of Luther's marriage were not less remarkable. While the blood of the peasants, who had been excited to rebellion by his preaching, was flowing in torrents . . . the Augustine monk chooses as his wife . . . a young nun . . . whom he had taken away from her convent on Good Friday . . . and but a few days after this fair wedding, he establishes the ignominy of his bride, and his own, by refusing to recognize her new born child.[1]

Erasmus, who informs us of this circumstance, rallied Œcolampadius on his marriage in these words: "Œcolampadius has just married a young person who is said to be very beautiful. This is the way he wished to subdue his flesh! . . . It is of no use saying that Lutheranism is a

[1] *Life of Luther*, by Audin, t. iii. ch. 8 and 9.

tragical thing; I am persuaded, myself, that nothing is more comic, for, as in all comedies, the denouement of the play is always a marriage."

Still these reformed marriages had sometimes a tragical end. Henry VIII. put away four of his wives, and by his orders two of them perished on the scaffold. He made the Parliament add two strange provisions to the law of marriage; the first that any one who should become acquainted with any incontinence of the Queen, must accuse her, on pain of high treason. The second that any young lady who should engage to marry the King of England after having lost her virginity, should accuse herself of it, under the same penalty. At his death, says *Feller*, he admitted that he had never refused any man's life to his hatred, nor any woman's honor to his lusts. His bastard daughter, Elisabeth, was not more humane, nor more chaste. As to Cranmer, their coöperator in the work of reformation, it is known that this archbishop of Canterbury was a bigamist. Knox that Reformer of Marriage in Scotland, counted his mother-in-law among the numerous victims of his disorders. In Switzerland Zuinglius, having passed too quickly from the profession of arms to the ecclesiastical state, soon grew tired of the celibate and took a rich widow to wife. Calvin murmured at all these scandals: "At the present day," says he, "you scarcely find one christian in ten who preserves the purity of faith to the end. Almost all degenerate, and allow themselves to be carried away by licentious teachers into the irregularities of a profane and corrupt life."[1] And in his book on *Scandals*, he writes: "At the present day the pastors who go up into the pulpit, are the most shameful examples of perverseness and other vices. Hence it comes that their sermons have no more credit, no more authority than tales told by a player on the stage, and yet these gentlemen have the audacity to complain that they are despised, that they are ridiculed, that they are pointed

[1] In 2 Epist. Petr. c. 2.

at! For my own part I am rather astonished at the endurance of the people; I am surprised that the women and children do not cover them with dirt and filth."

But, on his own part, how did Calvin proceed in the reformation of morals; we shall learn from the lips of a Protestant author whose learning, disinterestedness and impartiality no one will dispute. The celebrated archbishop of Geneva, Galiffe, after having studied the history of his country for thirty-six years, writes thus at the beginning of the third volume of his Genealogical Notes: "As soon as the character and doctrine of Calvin were unveiled, the people nowhere entertained toward him any other sentiments than those of the deepest and the most merited hatred .... the people of Geneva were oppressed in the most infernal manner by the party of terror, which Calvin had organized, in which he enrolled as many as three hundred foreign auxiliaries in a single day, all in the vigor of their age, all armed, all fanatics or brigands .... a great number of these first refugees, whom at this day they wish to pass off for a legion of saints, were hung, or drowned, or beheaded, or scourged or banished for different crimes .... cheats, swindlers, coiners, murderers, spies, poisoners, had only to call themselves proselytes, to be received with open arms .... To those who imagine that Calvin did us good, I could show our registers covered with entries of illegitimate children; I could let them see that they exposed such children in every corner of the town and country; I would lay before them trials, hideous from their obscenity; wills in which fathers and mothers accuse their children not only of errors, but of crimes; transactions before notaries between young women and their lovers, who gave them in presence of their parents wherewithal to support their bastards; multitudes of forced marriages in which the delinquents were led from the church to the temple, of mothers abandoning their children to the hospital while they themselves lived in abundance with a second husband; enormous bundles of

lawsuits between brothers; heaps of secret denunciations; men and women burnt for witchcraft; sentences of death for other crimes in fearful numbers; and all this, not among the old Genevese whom Calvin talked of hanging by dozens, and whom provisionally he threw into confinement on bread and water, for having danced or sung,—but among those whom he had brought up under his own law and fed with his own mystic manna, in the last years of the XVIth century, and in the whole course of the XVIIth century when his lessons had borne their fruit, and as long as Geneva remained Calvinist."

Further on, the same author exhibits to us the first disciples of Calvin, "who on their return from exposing the fruits of their libertinage (sic), go to profane the temples by demonstrations of enthusiastic piety: false witnesses, spies, informers, seeking to hide their own frailty by passing sentences of death of inhuman severity; their victims dragged from the dungeon to the temple by officers to hear sermons by compulsion, in which their parents, their friends and themselves were treated, according to the Calvinist vocabulary as villians, scoundrels, rascals, dogs; their wives, daughters, and sisters, as—; the Emperor their sovereign as vermin; their fathers and mothers, as imps of satan devoured by everlasting flames .... and Calvin himself, calumniating and persecuting so many innocent persons that his words are become almost synonymous with calumny ... overthrowing all that was good and honorable for humanity, establishing the reign of the most ferocious intolerance, the grossest superstitions, the most impious dogmas ....—"That they should wish," he adds, "to bind us for ever to his carcass and make us stagnate with him in the infected form in which he mired himself and dragged their ancestors in along with him; surely this is insane, unworthy of an age of light, and what the most profound ignorance alone could make them conceive." In the article Calvin, he stigmatizes the heretic by a terrible epithet: he calls

him a *drinker of blood*, and is not afraid to say: "The decisive and fatal separation which he provoked, has cost the lives of many millions of men!"

It is useless, after these details, to occupy ourselves with the personal morals of the reformer of marriage at Geneva. The cure of Pont Evêque was a decrepit old man at forty. Men of consideration, such as the Cardinals de Richelieu and Hosius, affirm that his youth was scandalous and dishonored. Stapleton, the Abbé Soulier, and Bolsec, whom Galiffe believes to be sincere, assert facts of the gravest character against him. Bertholier was willing to prove them. Some indiscretions which he committed on his return from Noyon, brought on him the hatred of Calvin. That hatred did not pardon. But let us draw a veil over all these horrors! After having employed himself for a long time in finding a wife for Farel, who married when he was seventy years old, he himself espoused the widow of an Anabaptist. Madame Calvin had only one child by her second husband, which died in its birth, and the death of which did not draw a single tear from the eyes of its father. His brother had insubordinate sons and an adulterous wife, whom he repudiated in order to take another. When the Reformer died, public rumor, the ocular testimony of Harennius his pupil in theology, the precautions taken to withdraw his corpse from the eyes of all, and some imprudent words of Beza against *calumniators*, gave reason to think that the disease which caused his death was not one of the most honorable.

Let us add but one word about his successors and his coadjutors. In the letter to Bullinger, exhumed by M. Paul Henri (a Protestant), and written entirely by Farel or by Calvin;[1] they are represented as the worst of men; they are "Debauched, ignorant, stinking monks, who do not even take the trouble to conceal their infamy, &c."

[1] See the discourse of M. Rousselet de Sautieres (he could not have made use of the discoveries of Galiffe,) on the stain on Calvin's character, (*Sur la fletissure de Calvin,*) Nimes, 1839.

Beza publicly maintained relations with a woman before giving up his Priory of Longjumeau. He made himself celebrated by his licentious poetry, the faithful image of his morals; and when already an old man, he married a young girl.

Bonivard, another reformer, was according to Galiffe, "a very bad man and a much worse priest, who turned Protestant, in order to secure the support of the people of Berne against the duke of Savoy, married three times, and allowed his last wife to be beheaded on a false charge of adultery, without having, as he said himself in the course of the proceedings, anything else to reproach her, except that she often pressed him to preach and was not pleased that he drank so much with his friends. He publicly took a concubine in her place."

As to the other colleagues of the head of the new religion, "several," says Galiffe, "had very scandalous histories, the details of which cannot be introduced into a work intended for both sexes. I shall perhaps publish a few of them for the edification of our Tartuffes."

Notwithstanding all this, the Anabaptists of Munster continue to hold the first rank among the Reformers of marriage. In that new Sion, as they called it, horrors might be seen which Constantinople had never beheld. The seraglio was in honor; the punishment of death was decreed against every one who should disapprove of that institution. One day they beheld the prophet, the king of Sion, go out in great pomp from his harem, sit in judgment in the market place on one of his wives who was guilty of resisting his desires, and cut off her head with his own hand, then begin to dance around her bleeding body! . . . .

Between the reformation of marriage effected by the Council of Trent, and that of which the authors were Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Ochin, Beza, Bonivard, Henry VIII., John of Leyden, &c., the choice cannot be difficult.

V.

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION.

HELD NOVEMBER 11, 1563.

Doctrine on the Sacrament of Matrimony.

The first parent of the human race, under the influence[1] of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said; *This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.*[2] But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, our Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, He said, *therefore now they are not two, but one flesh;*[3] and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, proclaimed so long before by Adam, by these words; *What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*[4] But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion; as the Apostle Paul intimates, saying: *Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it;* adding shortly after, *This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.*[5] Whereas therefore matrimony, in the evangelical law, excels in grace, through Christ, the ancient marriages; with reason have our holy Fathers, the Councils, and the tradition of the universal Church, always taught, that it is to be numbered amongst the sacraments of the new law; against which, impious men of this age raging, have not only had false notions touching this venerable sacrament, but, introducing according to their wont, under the pretext of the Gospel, a carnal liberty, they have by word and writing asserted, not without great injury to the faithful of Christ, many things alien from the sentiment of the Catholic Church, and from the usage approved of since the times of the Apostles; the holy and universal Synod wishing to meet the rashness of these men, has thought it proper, lest their pernicious contagion may draw more after it, that the more remarkable heresies and errors of the above-named schismatics be exterminated, by decreeing against the said heretics and their errors the following anathemas.

[1] Instinctu, inspiration. [2] Genes. ii. 23, 24. [3] Matth. xix. 6.
[4] Matth. xix. 6. [5] Ephes. v. 25, 32.

On the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Canon I.—If any one saith, that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelical law, (a sacrament) instituted by Christ the Lord, but that it has been invented by men in the Church; and that it does not confer grace; let him be anathema.

Canon II.—If any one saith, that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that this is not prohibited by any divine law; let him be anathema.

Canon III.—If any one saith, that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity, which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of those degrees, or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it; let him be anathema.

Canon IV.—If any one saith, that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema.

Canon V.—If any one saith, that on account of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or the affected[1] absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony may be dissolved; let him be anathema.

Canon VI.—If any one saith, that matrimony contracted, but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion by one of the married parties; let him be anathema.

Canon VII.—If any one saith, that the Church has erred, in that she has taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and Apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage, during the life-time of the other; and, that he is guilty of adultery, who having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband; let him be anathema.

Canon VIII.—If any one saith, that the Church errs, in that she declares that, for many causes, a separation may take place between husband and wife, in regard of bed, or in regard of cohabitation, for a determinate or for an indeterminate period; let him be anathema.

Canon IX.—If any one saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders, or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid,

[1] Affectatam, designed, voluntary.

notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or vow; and that the contrary is nothing else than to condemn marriage; and, that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity, even though they have made a vow thereof, may contract marriage; let him be anathema; seeing that God refuses not that gift to those who ask for it rightly, neither does *He suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able.*[1]

CANON X.—If any one saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above[2] the state of virginity, or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.

CANON XI.—If any one saith, that the prohibition of the solemnization of marriages at certain times of the year, is a tyrannical superstition, derived from the superstition of the heathen; or, condemn the benedictions and other ceremonies which the Church makes use of therein; let him be anathema.

CANON XII.—If any one saith, that matrimonial causes do not belong to[3] ecclesiastical judges; let him be anathema.

[1] 1 Cor. x. 13.
[2] Anteponendum, preferred before.
[3] Spectare ad.

CHAPTER EIGHTEENTH.

OF PURGATORY.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION.

I.

Existence of Purgatory. Proofs derived from Scripture and Tradition.

We have now seen what *instruments* our heavenly Physician employs to work in us that wonderful cure of sin, which is called justification. But the important question of the efficacy of this remedy, which we have already treated of though briefly (chap. ix.), requires at this point to be more fully developed.

A justified man is necessarily freed, by the merits of Jesus Christ, both from all mortal sin, since that kind of sin is irreconcileable with justification,* and from the eternal penalty which mortal sin deserves, to which God could not condemn his friends.

But he may have to undergo temporal penalties, either as the chastisement of those venial sins which do not destroy justice in him, and which notwithstanding call for punishment; or as the remains of the debt, that has to be paid on account of deadly sins committed since his baptism, and afterwards remitted—yet remitted on condition that they should be punished in time instead of in eternity.

"The necessity of our having to undergo this punishment," says Bossuet, "is not in any wise inconsistent with the doctrine that Jesus Christ has sufficiently satisfied for our sins. Having made a superabundant satisfaction to God,

* See chap. ix.

He may apply that infinite satisfaction to us in two ways: either by granting us an entire exemption from all punishment without reserve, or by commuting a greater punishment to a less, that is to say, eternal to temporary penalties. As the former mode is more complete and conformable to His goodness, He uses it first of all in Baptism; the second He employs in the remission which He grants to baptized persons who fall back into sin; finding Himself in some sense constrained to do this by the ingratitude of those, who have abused His first gifts, so that they have to suffer some temporal chastisement, though the eternal punishment is remitted. Hence we must conclude, not that Jesus Christ has not made an entire satisfaction for us, but on the contrary, that having acquired an absolute right over us by the infinite price which He has paid for our salvation, He grants His pardon on such conditions, under such a law, and with such reserves as He pleases."

What can be more just, than that a man should have to undergo passing pains for his lighter faults? What more conformable to those words of Jesus Christ; that "men shall render an account of every idle word;" that "not one jot, nor one tittle of the law shall pass: heaven and earth shall pass, but my words shall not pass;"[1] What is more clearly proved by history, which shows us venial sin punished in this world in the instance of Lot's wife,[2] Moses,[3] Oza,[4] David,[5] Ananias and Sapphira,[6] &c.? "And should not punishment always be proportioned to offences?" exclaims M. de Maistre.[7] "Whom shall we persuade to believe that the soul of Robespierre sprung from the scaffold into the bosom of God, like that of Louis XVI.? .... Who ever dreamed of having a soldier shot for stealing a pipe in a barrack? Still that pipe is not to be stolen with impunity: it is necessary that the thief

[1] Matth. xii. 36; Matth. v. 18; Matth. xxiv. 35.
[2] Genes. xix. 26. [3] Deuter. xxxiv. 4. [4] 2 Reg. vi.
[5] 2 Reg. xxiv. [6] Act. v. [7] Soirees, 8th entretien.

should be *purged* of this theft, before he can take his place in the line with brave and honest fellows."

It is no less certain that, if a man who has once been pardoned falls back into iniquity, he ought, even if he return to justice, to receive the chastisement of his ingratitude; that if God shows him mercy a second or a third time, it ought to be continually on more onerous terms. Nothing is more equitable, more calculated to keep him in his duty, by preventing him from abusing the facility of pardon.

Earthly judges proceed in this way. When a prince pardons a criminal, he generally allows him to undergo a lighter punishment, which may give satisfaction to the law and to public justice. Reconciliation between offended persons is effected only on the condition, that the offended shall at least express regret.

This law is written on the conscience of all nations and of all men. What people visited by a scourge, as plague, war or famine, has failed to recognize in these calamities the chastisement of heaven? What man, when after passing many years in a criminal life, he at last receives the powerful grace of conversion, does not feel that he ought to punish himself for his long continued infidelities?

What do we not learn from the tears, the sighs, the cries of grief, the story of fearful macerations, with which those affecting prayers, we call *the penitential psalms*, are filled! David knew well that the Sovereign Judge, when pardoning his sin, had yet reserved to Himself the power of punishing him with severe penalties. When he exclaimed with the keenest feelings of repentance, "*I have sinned against the Lord*," Nathan had replied: "The Lord also hath taken away thy sin: thou shalt not die. Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing, the child that is born to thee shall surely die."[1]

[1] 2 Reg. xii. 13.

And what is the meaning of those words of the Holy Spirit: "Be not without fear about sin forgiven?"[1]—and of the practice of the Church always inflicting a penance on the repenting sinner whom she absolves?"

Besides, what does simple reason tell us? Temporal punishments are most frequently the necessary effect of sin committed. Ill-health is the fruit of intemperance; misery, the result of idleness and extravagance. These punishments inflict on the repentant sinner the privations and sufferings which he was to undergo originally for his trial, but from which he withdrew himself by sin. They vindicate the law and restore its authority, attesting by sensible facts that its observance produces order and good—its violation, disorder and evil; they recall men to compunction, to humility and self-distrust; they guard against temptation and the danger of a relapse; they serve as an exercise, a stimulant, and a complement to contrition of heart: endured by a just man in union with the sufferings of Jesus Christ, they have power to derive from the merits of the Redeemer a virtue which will satisfy for the past and merit for the future.

These temporal punishments then are deserved by the guilty person and are due to the divine justice.

Therefore, the Church charged to bind and to loose consciences, to remit on equitable conditions, or to retain sins, can inflict them on the offender; and when she does so, she is said to impose on them a *satisfaction* or *penance*.

Therefore, the Church, having regard to the fervor of the penitents and to other good works, which she prescribes them, can also relax something of the punishment, which is due to them, and then she is said to grant them an *indulgence*.

These two conclusions will be developed in the next chapter but now comes a third.

Therefore, there is a place where these pains are endured . . . ; and when that place is not this our valley of

[1] Eccli. v. 5.

tears, our work-field, our bed of agony, it must be beyond the grave.

Our divine Master, in the parable of the wicked rich man, called it "Abraham's bosom;"[1] but that name can be no longer applicable to it, since Abraham has entered into glory in the train of our Saviour; St. Peter calls it the "prison of spirits;"[2] and it was thither, he tells us, that our Redeemer descended after His death to carry the good news of salvation to the contemporaries of Noah. The Greek Fathers called it Καθαρσις, and the Latins, *Purgatory.*

When Jesus Christ speaks of certain sins which "shall not be forgiven either in this world, or in the world to come,"[3] He evidently implies that for other sins there is a a place of propitiation and remission. Such is the reasoning of St. Augustine.[4]

The purifications or baptisms for the dead, practised by the first christians, as St. Paul testifies,[5] prove that those pious believers who had been taught by the Apostles themselves, not only believed in Purgatory, but thought that by such works of penance they could pay the debts of the departed.

The Jews had the same belief. The aged Tobias said to his son, "Lay out thy bread and thy wine (as alms) upon the burial of a just man," that is to say, make the poor, whom thou feedest pray for the souls of the just.[6] In the second book of the Maccabees, we read that Judas "sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead;" and the sacred author adds: "It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."[7] This pious confidence inspired the penitent thief's dying prayer; "Lord, remember me when Thou shalt come into Thy kingdom."[8]

[1] Luc. xvi. 22. [2] 1 Petr. iii. 19. [3] Matth. xii. 32.
[4] *De Civ. Dei*, l. xxi. c. 16. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 29.
[6] Tob. iv. 18. [7] 2 Macc. xii. 43, etc. [8] Luc. xxiii. 42.

"From the earliest times," says M. Drach, "the Synagogue has prayed for the dead."[1] The modern Jews have preserved this practice, and it is from them that the Musselmans have received it.

The heathens themselves believed in the sufferings of the departed, assuaged by prayers and sacrifices. St. Clement of Alexandria, affirms it of the Stoics;[2] and Eusebius, of Zoroaster and of the Persians.[3] Virgil has described the abode where they expiate their sins, until, completely purified, they attain the blissful abodes.[4] Claudian attributes a purifying virtue to the waters of Lethe.[5]

Catholic tradition is perfectly unanimous on this point. Calvin could not avoid acknowledging that for thirteen hundred years (before his time) all the Fathers had taught the usefulness of prayers for the dead.[6] The evidence of facts elicited the same confession from several doctors of the reformed religion, as Daillé, Forbes, Bingham, Peter Martyr. Let us be content with a few testimonies.

St. Cyprian[7] speaks of those who after death "being tormented by long anguish for their sins, are cleansed and purified by fire for a long time." "They will perhaps be baptized in the other world with fire," says St. Gregory Nazianzen,[8] "that last baptism, which is both longer and more painful, (than Penance here), and consumes what is sinful.[8] "No one is able to partake of the divinity," says St. Gregory Nyssen, "unless the purgatorial fire has cleansed away the filth that is mixed in his soul.[9] "He who has not cultivated this field (of his soul) well," says St. Augustin, "but has allowed it to be overgrown with thorns, has in this life a curse on all his works, and

[1] *De l'harmonie de l'Eglise et de la Synagogue*, t. i. p. 16.
[2] *Strom.* l. v. 1. [3] *Prep. Evang.* [4] Æneid, l. vi. 739, etc.
[5] Lethæo purgatos flumine
[6] *Inst.* l. iii. c. 5. [7] *Epist.* lv. alias lii.
[8] *Or.* xxxix *in S. Lumine.* [9] *Orat. pro defunctis.*

after this life will have either the fire of purgation or everlasting punishment."[1] In another place he says; "Some of the faithful are saved by a certain purgatorial fire, so much sooner or later, according as they have loved perishable goods; not however those of whom it is said they shall not possess the kingdom of God, unless those same crimes be forgiven them on being suitably penitent."[2]

It is on this faith that the universal practice of praying for the dead rests. "We make oblations for the departed," says Tertullian,[3] "on the anniversary of their deaths. If you require a scriptural command for these practices you will find none. Tradition is the authority for them, they are confirmed by custom and observed by faith." "We pray in general for all those who have fallen asleep from among us," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem,[4] witnessing to the faith of the East, "believing that the benefit will be very great to those souls, for which the supplication is sent up, while the holy and most awful sacrifice is lying on the altar." Of all the christian liturgies in use before the sixteenth century, there is not one, says Lebrun, which does not contain prayers for the dead.

The sign by which Archeologists recognize the grave stones which have been laid over Christians, is the touching inscription, "May they rest in peace."

We will urge this point no farther. Besides, at the present day, the majority of Protestants, as we shall soon see, agree in placing an intermediate state, a place *of purification*, *of expiation*, between the present life and the blessedness of heaven. That is sufficient for us: we shall not dispute about the words when we are agreed about the substance.

[1] *De Genes. cont. Manich.* l. ii, c. 20.
[2] *De Octo Dulcitii quæstionibus* q. 1, n. 13.
[3] *De Corona militis.* c. 3. 4.
[4] *Catech. Mystag.* v. (n. 9.)

II.

Advantages of this doctrine. Consolations it affords.

This doctrine is a most effectual encouragement to virtue, a sweet consolation at the hour of our last sufferings, and a source of precious hopes for one, who is summoned to appear suddenly before the tribunal of God.

It teaches us that the least commandments of the Lord will prove to have the weight of punishment attached to them, and that the lightest faults will undergo chastisement.

It reminds us that upon the one only foundation of christian life, which is faith in Jesus Christ, we ought to build the edifice of our salvation with solid materials, for it is written: "The fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."[1]

It resolves the problem, which is thus proposed by Origen: "For suppose that on Jesus Christ, the foundation, thou hast built not only gold and silver and costly stones, but also wood, or hay, or stubble, what wouldst thou should be done to thee on departing this life? Wouldst thou enter into the holy places with thy wood, thy hay, thy stubble, so as to defile the kingdom of God? Or, on the other hand, wouldst thou, on account of the wood, the hay, and the stubble, remain in the fire and receive nothing for the gold and the silver and the costly stones? Neither is this reasonable. What then does it follow that thou shouldst first receive on account of the wood? Evidently the fire that consumes the wood and the hay and the stubble, since, for those, who are able to understand, our God is said to be in His essence "a consuming fire." . . . What then is it that is consumed? He does not consume that which is according to His image

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 13. [2] *Hom.* xvi. *in Jerem.* n. 5, 6.

and likeness, but that which has been built upon it, the wood, the hay, the stubble. . . He spares only our good works, which are reserved in order to be recompensed."

This dogma leads us to anticipate, by works of piety, charity and mercy, that day when the Sovereign Judge, will require an account of our whole life, and to conform ourselves to the teaching of our good Master: "Be at agreement with thy enemy betimes, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest perhaps the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Amen, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out from thence till thou pay the last farthing."[1]

It makes us receive with resignation and even with joy the sufferings of life. "Inasmuch as every sin must be expiated in this world or in the other, it follows that afflictions sent to us by the divine justice are a real blessing; since these sufferings, when we have the wisdom to accept them, are, so to speak, deducted from those of the future."[2]

It allows us to hope well of the future of those who leave this world, without having edified it by great virtues, but also without having grieved it by the scandal of their impenitence. And who among us can say, that he shall not be of this number?

At our last hour, when faith tells us that nothing undefiled will enter into the heavenly Jerusalem,[3] when nevertheless memory reminds us of many defilements, which our conscience repudiates and deplores, the thought of the expiations of the other life preserves us from despair, and enables us to say when dying with that model of suffering souls; "Although He slay me, yet will I trust in Him."[4]

Prayer for the dead, a practical consequence of the doctrine of purgatory, is a soothing satisfaction to the most

[1] Matth. v. 25, 26.
[2] M. de Maistre, *Soirees*, 8th entretien.
[3] Apoc. xxi. 27.
[4] Job, xiii. 15.

imperious necessities of the heart. It changes tears heretofore barren into works of piety and mercy; it causes our sorrow to be a succor to the object of our love and makes it in consequence less bitter; it establishes and maintains between ourselves and those who leave us the most pleasing and salutary relations, a continual exchange of services and of precious help. "Admirable relations," exclaims Chateaubriand,[1] "between the living son and the departed father, between the mother and the daughter, the husband and the wife! between life and death .... While I share what I have to spare with the poor, God, to recompense me, will withdraw my father, my mother, from a place of suffering .... That same penny which goes to give his daily bread to a poor sufferer, will perhaps give to a delivered soul a place for all eternity at the table of the Lord!"

What heart does not thrill at such a thought! Who among us does not see some one of those, to whom we owe more than life, appear, to exhort us to the work of prayer and the labors of virtue! Who does not exclaim, when watering with his tears, the tomb of a father or a mother: O beloved soul! whom so many virtues and good works have recommended to the clemency of the great Judge; whom so many sufferings have so long tried and purified before my eyes, whom a death very bitter indeed but sanctified by religion and consoled by its hopes, has so quickly withdrawn from my embraces,—I hope for thy everlasting salvation from the divine goodness and the merits of Jesus Christ; but I know not, if it is yet consummated by thy entrance into glory. In this uncertainty, I pray for thee, and I unite to my prayer the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which I daily offer upon his altar. My prayer, made effectual by our Saviour's blood solaces thee if thou art still suffering, increases thy blessedness if at length thou art enjoying the vision of God; it obtains for myself the favors of heaven in greater abund-

[1] *Genie du Christ. Purgatoire.*

ance. The remembrance of thee accompanies me everwhere; the desire of hastening thy happiness urges me on and unceasingly stimulates my zeal. I feel thee present by my side as my good genius, which at one time encourages me to prayer and self devotion, at another assures me of thy maternal protection. Death, in separating our bodies, has only brought our souls nearer to each other. Formerly I surrounded thee with my attentions, and was myself the object of thy tenderest solicitude; now I still love and still am loved, and now more than ever is my love capable of helping thee, and is itself repaid by thee. What purity is there not in this love! What holiness in the works which it imposes! What a charm in the consolations it procures! What a mysterious and holy association is that, which unites in a community of mutual aid the visible and invisible life, time and eternity! the just who is still engaged in the combat, with him who is having his wounds healed in an exile, that must soon end, and him who is already enjoying the glory and the triumph of heaven!

III.

Errors of Protestants respecting Purgatory.

Let us see what heresy alleges against this doctrine so holy, this practice so religious and so consoling.

Justification, as understood by Protestants, having in it nothing real, and leaving sin still existing in the soul, should necessarily have been followed by a period of purification, preparing the elect person, already delivered by death from the bonds of this present life, to free himself at length from the grasp of sin. A purgatory then was much more essential in the theory of the reformers than in the Catholic theory.

Accordingly Luther wrote: "We must believe firmly in purgatory; and I know it is most true, that the poor souls there suffer inexpressible pains, and that we ought

to come to their aid by prayers, fastings, alms, and all the means, that are in our power."[1]

"Yes," he says in another place, "I am most certain that there is a purgatory; and on this point I am noways moved by the cacklings of heretics. I know that in the fourth century St. Augustine states in the ninth book of his Confessions, that he prays for his father and mother, and that he requests the prayers of others for them. He tells me that in her last moments his mother had besought him to remember her at the altar; he gives me almost the same details respecting St. Ambrose; but even supposing that purgatory had not been spoken of in the times of the Apostles, are we from that to conclude that the belief of so many ages is false, as this heretical Picard does, who came into the world fifty years ago?"[2]

And yet in the articles of Smalcald, Luther declares that we are not to believe in this dogma, and that it is a mere invention of the devil: *Mera diaboli larva!*

Calvin acknowledges that in all times and places prayers have been offered for the purification of the souls of the dead; that for thirteen centuries, christians have thought and acted on this point like all the rest of mankind.[3] But he attributes this ancient and universal belief to superstition, to some sort of hypocritical emulation, which impelled Christians not to do less for their dead friends than was done by unbelievers. Here we see the elevation of view and the delicacy of sentiment, which Calvin possessed. He concluded that all the strength of his voice, of his throat, of his lungs ought to be expended in proclaiming that purgatory is a deadly invention of Satan, which annihilates the virtue of the cross, insults the divine mercy and utterly destroys the Christian faith.

[1] Latin Edition of Wittenberg, part. vii. fol. 7. *Instructions on some articles.*

[2] Latin Edition of Wittenberg, part. i. fol. 112. *Dissertation on Indulgences.*

[3] Ante mille et trecentos annos usu receptum fuit ut precationes fierent pro mortuis. *Inst.* l. iii. c. 5. n. 6.

"They who defile the purity of the divine word with this *excrement* which they call purgatory," he says, "of necessity lose both their time and their trouble."

The confession of Augsburg teaches that just souls do not enter heaven before the resurrection of the dead; accordingly its supporters take care not to call Mary herself Blessed. But what then do those souls do between their departure from this world and the day of final judgment? Some Anabaptists had said that they slept. Calvin published his first work in reply to them.[1] He holds that the souls are awake. But in that case, is it possible that they should not seek with the most ardent desires after the vision and possession of God? they who when on earth said with the Apostle: "I have a desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ, a thing far better (than to live here)?"[2] Is not this desire of heaven, frustrated day by day, a real purgatory, but a purgatory, which endures equally long for all souls, and for them all lasts as long as the world?

Those who let them sleep, or who suppose, as Reinhard does in his Dogmatic, that they are stunned and left without consciousness under the stroke of death, maintain that at the day of judgment, in the twinkling of an eye, they will be purified from every stain, and made fit to enter heaven. Here again we have a purgatory, only not the name; and besides this view very foolishly imposes on God the necessity of doing in an instant what He does, as He does all else, in number, weight and measure. Others have returned to the heathen metempsychosis; as Schlosser, Herder, G. Monod, &c.

The Oxford school admits a middle state between heaven and hell, in which the soul, by the sufferings it inflicts on itself, is purified from its stains. Young Stilling calls it ἀδης.[3]

The purgatory of Swedenborg, *according to the testimony*

[1] *Traitè de la Psychopannichie*, Orleans, 1534.
[2] Philip. i. 23. [3] Geisterkunde.

of his eyes and ears, is this:[1] "The third state through which the souls of the departed pass consists especially in receiving instruction preparatory to entering heaven. The angels of the Northern and Southern regions give these instructions. The places where they are given are very large, and distinguished according to the class and species of heavenly blessings, which each one is destined to possess. Each is taught according to his temper, his affections and his disposition for receiving this instruction . . . Those who are still defiled by some slight stains are purified from them by a short abode among the good spirits. Some, whose stains are more serious, are purified from them in those places by sufferings under the soles of their feet . . . In the foreground are the human spirits, male and female, that died in infancy, who have already received the instruction of youth from female spirits, to whose care they had been intrusted for this purpose. Behind are the places where those are taught, who died as adults and whose predominant affection was the love of what is true and good. After them come the Mahometans . . . who, finding no more help in Mahomet, draw near to the Saviour, recognize His divinity, adore Him and are then instructed in the Christian religion. Nearer the North are the Gentiles . . . who are the more easy to instruct inasmuch as they had the idea of a God visible under human form . . . The best of them are the Africans. . . . The time of their teaching being finished, these spirits are clothed in white robes; are led to the angels who guard the door of heaven; they transmit them to other angels, and God introduces them into the angelic society which is suited to them. (No. 812.)

"Those that have lived in the Society of Jesus slip noiselessly among the reformed, or send among them, by means of covered ways and paths unknown to others,

[1] *Wonders of heaven and hell and the planetary and astral worlds*, by Emmenuel de Swedenborg, *according to the testimony of his own eyes and ears*. Berlin, 1782.

secret emissaries to seduce them. As soon as they are discovered, their audacity is punished, and they are sent back into their Society or else cast down into hell. (Supplement, No. 26.)

"As to those Catholics whom the Popes have declared to be saints, they are set apart, and placed in the spiritual world out of sight of those who honored them, . . . and those who have lived as saints, in order to be reputed such, are in hell . . . I spoke to one of them who on earth is called Xavier. From his discourse I conclude that he was reduced to a state of imbecility and absolutely an idiot. He had, however, sense enough to tell me that, in the place where he is confined, he is not an imbecile, but that he becomes so as often as he takes it into his head that he is a saint." (Ibid. No. 23.)

With ideas such as these, Emmanuel de Swedenborg, *of the society of the Angels*, as he called himself, became the head of a sect, which, under the name of Martinists (or Swedenborgians), soon became numerous in London and Paris; for our Lord has said: "I am come in the Name of my Father, and you receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive."[1]

Lastly, a great number of rationalists, among whom we may mention Ammon, Klaiber, Hencke, Wegscheider, Cheneviére, Coquerelle, etc., will only allow a temporary hell for the punishment of the wicked, that is to say, a purgatory. "The eternity of punishments," Cheneviére says plainly, "is repugnant alike to the nature of God and of man."[2]

Thus has heresy, in order to supply the place of the Catholic purgatory and to justify the abandonment, in which it leaves the dead, exhausted all possible combinations of error. It has invented a momentary purgatory, which does its work in an instant; and a purgatory as enduring as the world; a sleeping purgatory, and a waking purgatory; a hell purgatory and a Hades purgatory, &c.

[1] Joan. v. 43. [2] Dogmat. ch. vii.

And the remark of M. de Maistre[1] is daily justified by more numerous facts: "When those who have rebelled against the Church become philosophers, they begin to deny the eternity of punishments, allowing nevertheless the existence of a temporary hell, simply as a matter of policy, and for fear of making Nero and Messalina go up straight into heaven, by the side of St. Louis and St. Theresa. But a temporary hell is nothing else than a purgatory; so that after having quarrelled with us because they would have no purgatory, they quarrel with us again, because they will have nothing but a purgatory."

All quarrelling and confusion ceasing, we will go and listen with perfect docility to the several definitions of the Council relative to this consolatory doctrine.

IV.

SIXTH SESSION.

CANON XXX.—If any one saith, that, after the grace of Justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt[2] is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment[3] is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment[4] to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him); let him be anathema.

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION.

Chapter ii. (on the Sacrifice of the Mass).—Not only for the sins, punishments,[5] satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified,[6] is it rightly offered, agreeably to a tradition of the Apostles. . . . .

CANON III.—If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the mass . . . . . ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for

[1] *Soirees*, 8th entretien. [2] Culpa.
[3] Reatus æternæ pœnæ, condemnation to eternal punishment.
[4] Reatus pœnæ temporalis, condemnation to a temporal punishment.
[5] Pœnis, pains. [6] Purgatus, purged.

sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION.

Decree concerning Purgatory.

Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught, in sacred Councils, and very recently[1] in this œcumenical Synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped[2] by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated[3] multitude. In like manner, such things as are uncertain, or which labor under an appearance of error,[4] let them not allow to be made public and treated of. While those things, which tend to a certain kind of curiosity or superstition, or which savor of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals, and stumbling-blocks of the faithful. But let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the faithful, who are living, to wit, the sacrifices of mass, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which have been wont to be performed by the faithful for the other faithful departed, be piously and devoutly performed, in accordance with the institutes of the church; and that whatsoever is due on their behalf, from the endowments of testators, or in other way, be discharged, not in a perfunctory manner, but diligently and accurately, by the priests and ministers of the church, and others who are bound to render this (service).

[1] See Sess. vi., can. 30; Sess. xxii. cap. 2, 3, (quoted above).
[2] Juvari, relieved. [3] Rudem. [4] Specie falsi laborant.

CHAPTER NINETEENTH.

ON INDULGENCES.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION.

I.

The true meaning of Indulgences, and the power possessed by the Church of granting them.

An indulgence means pardon.

A pardon may be applied to a *sin* to blot out the guilt of it, or to a punishment to grant the remission of it. That punishment may be either eternal or temporal.

Never has the Church pretended, by means of her indulgences, to pardon guilt or sin; neither has she ever believed that she remitted by this means the eternal punishment due to sin: but, that eternal punishment having been already remitted, when the sin is pardoned in the sacrament of Penance, the Church believes that she has the power, in certain cases, and for just reasons, to commute the temporal punishments, which remain to be undergone, for other works, less painful perhaps, but which she judges to be under certain relations more advantageous; and it is this remission by way of commutation which is called an *Indulgence.*

We have not now to prove that this punishment, which must be undergone either in the present life or in purgatory, may survive the sin pardoned and the eternal punishment remitted; that proof has been given in the preceding chapter. What remains to be established is, that the supreme authority of the church can take cognizance of this punishment, whether it be to inflict it in the tribunal of Penance, or independently of that sacrament,

or to commute and mitigate it, when there are just grounds to recommend such a course.

Now this power belongs to the Church, first, because it is necessary to it; secondly, because it is inherent in all sovereign authority: thirdly, because it is evidently contained in that large concession: *Whatsoever you shall bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*[1] As also in the words: *I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven;*[2] and in those others: *Feed the flock of God.*[3] *God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.*[4] *He hath made us dispensers of His mysteries.*[5]

The *shepherd* can strike with his crook, but he can also take the strayed sheep on his shoulders, and spare it not only blows, but also the fatigue of its return. Peter holds the *keys* of heaven, only to open its gates to us, by removing the obstacles, which would stop us at the entrance. To *bind* is to oblige under penalty; to *loose* is to take away that obligation and the penal sanction attached to it.

As the Father hath sent me, I also send you, said our Saviour to His Apostles;[6] and, in fact, in the mission which He thus gives them, He includes the eminently divine power of remitting sins. Now, Jesus Himself at the same time that He exercised this power, exercised also that of giving indulgences. Thus when He remits their sins to the paralytic and to the woman taken in adultery, He cures the one of his long malady, the fruits of his sins, and refuses to condemn the other to the punishment of death pronounced by the law.[7]

The Apostle delivers to Satan the incestuous Corinthian,[8] but scarcely has a year elapsed after that terrible excommunication, when he pardons him in the name of Jesus Christ, and through regard to the prayers and fervor of the christians of that city. "To him that is such

[1] Matth. xvi. 19; and xviii. 18. [2] Matth. xvi. 19.
[3] 1 Petr. v. 2. [4] 2 Cor. v. 18. [5] 1 Cor. v. 4.
[6] Joan. xx. 21. [7] Marc. ii. 5, and Joan. viii. 3, etc.
[8] 1 Cor. v. 4.

a one, this rebuke is sufficient that is given by many. So that contrariwise you should rather pardon and comfort him. What I have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, for your sake have I done it, in the person of Christ."[1]

A few years later St. Zephyrinus exercised indulgence towards certain sinners guilty of adultery, St. Cornelius towards Serapion who had denied the faith, etc. . At the period when different degrees of canonical penance were established, we see that the bishops possessed the power of remitting them.[2]

And this power was necessary: for some penitents manifested such repentance, such fervor, that it was impossible to maintain the severity of the canons in their case without excess of rigor. The intensity of their penitence ought in all equity to diminish its duration. This ground is approved by the Council of Nice (canon 121), by the Council of Ancyra in 314, by that of Lerida, by St. Basil (*Ep. ad Amphiloch*).

Sometimes also an imminent persecution placed the penitents in the happy necessity of receiving the Eucharist without longer delay. "Since it gives so great strength and protection to those who receive it," wrote St. Cyprian "we ought not to deprive of this succor those, whom we wish to arm against the enemy."

The danger of approaching death was to obtain the same indulgence for a repenting sinner. A Council of Carthage, speaking of those who begged to be received to penitence in sickness, said; "If it be thought that he is about to die immediately, let him be reconciled by the imposition of hands, and let the Eucharist be given him."

The intercession of those who had deserved well of the church was also a ground for showing indulgence, but most especially the recommendation of the confessors of the faith, who were reserved for martyrdom or who had escaped it. The penitents had recourse to their media-

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 10. [2] Wiseman's *Lectures: on Indulgences.*

tion, they clung to their steps when they were being led to the scaffold, prostrated themselves at their feet, while the executioners prepared the instruments of torture, and when they were able to present themselves to the pastors of the Church, with a supplication signed by their hand or sealed with their blood, were sure of being soon admitted to reconciliation. "We believe," says St. Cyprian (*de Lapsis*,) "that the merits of the martyrs and the works of the just have very great power before the Judge." He wrote to his clergy (*Ep.* xii *ad clerum*) that "those who had received letters of recommendation from the martyrs might in case of sickness, without waiting for his presence make confession of their sin before any priest whatever. . . that hands having been laid upon them unto penitence they may go to the Lord with that peace which the martyrs by their letters to us, desired might be granted to them." Tertullian at first approved this discipline; afterwards, when he had fallen into the errors of the Montanists, he assailed it with his invectives: "If thou art thyself a sinner," he says to a martyr interceeding for penitents, "how can the oil of thy lamp be sufficient both for thee and me?"[1]

During ten consecutive centuries, every year, on Holy Thursday, those of the faithful who had received sacramental absolution at the beginning of Lent, were absolved from all further penance. According to the Roman *Ordo*, on Ash Wednesday a priest ought to exhort all christians that now, at the beginning of the fast, they should make a sincere confession of their sins and receive a fitting penance. He afterwards tells them that they can come to be reconciled on the day of the *cœna Domini*.

In the sixth century, St. Gregory the Great accords indulgences to those, who visit the stations of Rome. In the seventh, St. Leo concedes indulgences to the churches of France and Germany; Pope Sergius, in the ninth, to the church of St. Martin—*des-Monts*. In the year 1000,

[1] *De Pudicitia*, c. 22. [2] Levit. xxv. 10.

Sylvester II. published the first plenary indulgence called the *Jubilee.*

As the institutions of the chosen people were shadows and figures of ours, we are allowed to see in the Jewish *jubilee*, an announcement and representation, though it be altogether material, of the Christian jubilee. Every fiftieth year, says the book of Leviticus, shall be a *holy* year, a year of *remission*, during which the land shall be left at rest, and each person shall re-enter into possession of his property or of his liberty which bad times had obliged him to mortgage.

Thus are our years of jubilee holy by the fruits of sanctification which they produce in us, and by our more perfect detachment from the goods and the pleasures of earth. Thus, by virtue of the indulgence, if we are able to gather its entire fruits, the debt which we have to pay to the justice of God is remitted, and we are restored to all the liberty of the true children of God.

In the thirteenth century, the Council of Lateran established the limits which archbishops and bishops ought not to pass in the concession of these spiritual favors; and a little later the general Councils of Lyons and of Vienna marked out and branded certain abuses, unhappily inevitable, which had made their way into the distribution of them.

The Council of Trent therefore could well say: "Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church; and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power, delivered unto her of God; the holy Synod teaches, and enjoins, that the use of Indulgences, for the Christian people, most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church."

[1] Luc. vii. 42.

II.

Advantages which Christian society derives from the Indulgences of the Church.

The Council also defines that this practice is *salutary for the christian people.* And indulgence, in fact, is granted only to just souls, who, truly repenting of the sins they had previously committed and which have been already pardoned, have faithfully performed the works of piety, charity or mortification prescribed by the legitimate authority, and have thereby prepared themselves to obtain, according to the degree of their fervor, a larger share in the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the Saviour of mankind.

Now it is certainly useful and encouraging for such souls to receive some facility for the payment of their debts. Their ardor for good is thereby excited, and their love increases in proportion as they have more forgiven them by God. Of the debtors who have nothing to pay, it is he who has the largest sum remitted, who owes the warmest gratitude to his creditor.

The mere *announcement* of the indulgence conceded reminds us of the necessity of offering to God, either in this life or in the life to come, a full and entire satisfaction even for sins already pardoned.

The *form* of this concession, remitting so many *days*, so many *weeks*, so many *years* of penance, reminds us of the rigor, with which the primitive church visited sin, and excites us to accomplish, in the spirit, which animated the penitents of that age of faith, the lighter satisfactions substituted for the canonical penances. Besides, this formula, "An indulgence of so many days, so many years to those who perform such a work," means that this work performed with the required dispositions—repentance for sins committed is always one of these dispositions—is accepted by the church as the equivalent for the penance which, according to the ancient canons, she might have

imposed for so many days, so many weeks, so many years. A plenary indulgence remits all the temporal punishment which the sinner would have had to undergo.

The *clause* always annexed to the indulgence, of being *truly penitent*, and that of *having made an entire confession*, which almost always accompanies a plenary indulgence, proclaim the indispensable necessity of a sincere repentance and an entire confession of our grievous sins in order to satisfy God.

The *preaching* of the indulgence revives the faith of christians, renews their fervor, brings many a soul that had gone astray back to the paths of virtue and truth.

The *works* required are those, which are most useful and most meritorious, either absolutely or relatively to times and places. Most frequently Eucharistic communion is one of the works required for obtaining a plenary indulgence. Meditation on the sufferings of Jesus Christ in going over the way of the Cross, assembling before the sacred tabernacles on the days of the greatest solemnities, visiting prisons, hospitals, and instructing the ignorant, are works urgently recommended and largely endowed with indulgences. If it happens that by reason of special circumstances, some work has need of extraordinary encouragement, as the deliverance of the holy places, alms and prayers for the Propagation of the Faith, the Church, with the view of aiding it, opens and dispenses her treasures.

"We grant these indulgences," says Clement VI. in the bull of the Jubilee of 1350, "to the end that the piety of the Roman people and of all the faithful may be increased; that their faith may shine with fresh lustre, that their hope may become more firm, their charity more active and fervent."

And history attests that the confidence of the Sovereign Pontiffs has not been deceived. The saying of d'Alembert is well known, complaining of the Jubilee of 1775 as having "delayed the revolution by twenty years." "An-

other jubilee such as this," Voltaire had said, "and it is all over with philosophy."

"This year of Jubilee, said Bellarmine, "is producing so great fruits of penitence, so many remarkable conversions, works of piety so numerous and so beautiful, that it may with reason be called *the holy year*, *the year acceptable to God*, *the fertile and fruitful year*." A volume was filled with the simple enumeration of the most remarkable works of piety done at Rome during the Jubilee published by Gregory XIII.; and, he goes on, we hope to see as much in 1600, under the most holy Father, Clement VIII.

The *fruit* of an indulgence is to remove from us the pains of this life, or at least to take from them the aggravating character of *punishments*, and to accelerate our entrance into glory by assisting us to discharge all our debts. Assuredly nothing can be more advantageous to us.

While by this motive the faithful are encouraged to profit by indulgences, the just detained in purgatory receive the benefit of those, which we gain for them. These suffering souls are no longer under the jurisdiction of the Church militant, she cannot therefore deliver them directly from their debt; but she may, by offering to God the equivalent of what they owe, ask and more readily obtain their deliverance; this is what is called applying an indulgence to the dead by way of suffrage; and it is one of the sweetest and most consoling consequences of the communion of saints. "The souls of the faithful departed are not separated from the Church," says St. Augustine;[1] "otherwise there would not be a commemoration made of them at the altar of God in the communication of the body of Christ." If, by his prayers, his alms, his satisfactory works, offered for the benefit of the dead, a simple believer can obtain from God the alleviation of their sufferings, far stronger reason have we to believe

[1] *De civit Dei.* l. xx. c. 9.

that this power of intercession belongs to the visible head of the Church, who is established by Jesus Christ as the minister of reconciliation, the dispenser of the divine mysteries, the depository of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.[1]

"What a magnificent picture," exclaims M. de Maistre, "is that of this immense commonwealth of spirits with its three orders ever in relation with each other! The world which is *engaged in the combat* holds out one hand to the world of *sufferers*, and seizes with the other that of the world of *those in triumph*. Thanksgiving, prayer, satisfactions, aid, inspirations, faith, hope, love, circulate from one to the other as beneficent streams. Nothing is isolated, and the souls, like the plates of a galvanic battery, enjoy both their own strength and that of all the others."

Meanwhile the church never ceases to exhort those, who are most eager to profit by these indulgences to the practice of all good works. "For in many things we all offend;"[2] we all have to "lay up treasures in heaven;"[3] and to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling;"[4] and if we ought to forgive our brother, "not seven times a day"[5] only, "but seventy times seven,"[6] may we not hope that the Lord in like manner pardons us on all our repentings? And then "when we have done all that is commanded us," we shall still have to implore forgiveness, to beg for grace and mercy, confessing that "we are unprofitable servants."[7]

III.

Variations and contradictions of Protestants on the subject of Indulgences.

Jesus Christ reproached the Jews of that generation with their spirit of contradiction. He compared them to

[1] Bellarmine, *De Indulg.* c. xiv.
[2] Jacob. iii. 2.
[3] Matth. vi. 20.
[4] Philip. ii. 12.
[5] Luc. xvii. 4.
[6] Matth. xviii. 22.
[7] Luc. xvii. 10.

a set of ill-tempered children, who, instead of playing, sat down in the open places of the city and addressed to each other these loud reproaches: "We have piped to you and you have not danced; we have lamented and you have not mourned."[1]

This is the very spirit of heresy. To contradict, to contradict again, and to contradict always, is its favorite theme. When the church orders fasting, abstinence, prayers, heresy reproaches it with severity and the wrong it does to the satisfaction of Jesus Christ, in pretending to add its own to them. When the church uses indulgence towards penitents already pardoned and absolved, heresy reproaches it with laxity, and with the claim it makes, to draw on the treasure of satisfaction of the God-Man.

Luther attaches so great a value to the preaching of indulgences, that he conceives a violent disgust on seeing this ministry entrusted to the Dominicans instead of his own order. Jealousy soon leads him to attack his rivals, then to attack certain abuses, of which probably they were guilty, then the very object of their preaching; and, finally, Indulgences become in his view and that of Calvin, and all the partisans of the new reform, nothing but "a disgrace, an imposture, a swindle, a robbery, a profaning of the blood of Christ, an invention of Satan, tending to turn aside christian people from the grace of God and the life which is in Christ."[2]

Meanwhile the reformers are called on to explain themselves as to the mystery of justification, and we have described their system which is accommodating enough. According to them, every sinner, without contrition, without confession, without satisfaction, without any work prescribed by the church, without the church having anything to do in the matter, obtains, by a simple act of faith in Jesus Christ, not only the non-imputation of every sin, but the remission of all punishment temporal

[1] Matth. xi. 17.

[2] *Instit.* l. iii. c. 5. n. 2.

and eternal; that is to say, of their own private authority, they attach to this act of faith, isolated from all repentance, from all conversion, the value and effect of the most complete indulgence! "You will have it," says P. Coton, to them,[1] "that an act of faith is to be your bull; a lifting up of the soul, your indulgence; a laying hold of of the death of Christ, your great Jubilee, delivering you from pain and guilt; and you will not allow that we, performing the same acts, and adding thereto contrition for our offences, the exact confession of our sins, participation in the Eucharist, prayers, alms and other good works, should be able to do what you yourselves can do at so small a cost? In truth this is going too far; and you run the risk of being like those who, 'not perceiving the beam in their own eye, discern the mote in the eye of their brother.'[2] Your justification by faith only is 'a camel which you swallow;'[3] and you cannot allow us our indulgences? There is 'a gnat' there, which disturbs and alarms you!

However trifling that gnat may be, it would disappear, if you were willing to study our doctrine carefully. But no, you take a pleasure in making it absurd, ridiculous, immoral, like your own theories. You who have invented a 'righteousness,' which cannot be lost, the emancipation by faith from all law, human and divine, etc., you assert that our indulgences are nothing but a general or special permission accorded us to sin with impunity for the future, on payment of a certain sum of money. This atrocious calumny is so widely diffused that, according to the *Revue Britannique*, 'the most learned Englishmen, from the poet-laureate down to the parish clerk, all believe that Catholics obtain these indulgences by anticipation.'[4] What are we to think of a cause which defends itself by means such as this?

[1] *Inst. catholique, Indulgences.* [2] Matth. vii. 13. [3] Matth. xxiii. 24.
[4] Tom. iii. an. 1829, p. 101. See *the Design of Christianity*, by Fowler; *the Man of Sin*, by Benson, etc.

What is true is, that Indulgences, such as the Roman Church grants, were long in vogue in a part of the reformed church. Thus, the canons of the Anglican church regulated the discipline relating to the commutations of the penances incurred by sin; so in its turn did their synod of 1640; and the Irish Parliament even complained to Charles I. of the abuses, which were introduced into this practice.[1]

What is also true is that Indulgences, such as they reproach us with believing in, have never been known or practised except by those, who with sincere conviction support the doctrine of justification by faith only, of a "righteousness" which in every good believer is proof against a thousand adulteries, a thousand murders committed in a single day, etc.

We do not say, as Porteus, Bretschneider, and others suppose, that the virtues and merits of one man can serve for the virtues and merits of another. Rather we say just the contrary.

We do not say as Otto, Fowler, Benson, and others reproach us with saying, that a Catholic "has only to let the merits of another be imputed to him, in order to benefit by them; and that thus no one has any need to fulfil the moral law with zeal." Our doctrine is wholly opposed to this.

We do not even teach, as an article of faith, that the superabundant satisfactions made by Jesus Christ in His own person, and in that of His Blessed Mother and of the Saints, form, as it were, a spiritual treasury, the dispensing of which belongs to the church, and from which she derives the right of granting indulgences; we have no need, in setting forth our doctrine, to make use of this opinion, which is engaging, in harmony with the words of St. Paul[2] and the Apostolic doctrine of the communion of saints, and to be viewed with respect, but it has not

[1] See Milner's *Excellence of the Catholic religion*, letter 42.

[2] See Perrone, *Tr. de gratia. De objecto meriti* [3] 2 Cor. viii. 14.

been defined by the Church, and, consequently, is apart from our controversies.

Yet it is on a precisely similar principle that the reformed themselves rest every day in practice, when at the prayer of a friend they receive the excuses of a repentant enemy, or release an insolvent debtor. "There is not one Protestant father of a family," says M. de Maistre, "who has not granted indulgences in his family, who has not pardoned one child that deserved punishment, on the intercession and merits of another child, with whom he had reason to be pleased; there is not a Protestant sovereign, who has not signed fifty indulgences in his reign, granting a place, remitting or commuting a punishment for the merits of fathers, brothers, sons, relations or ancestors. This principle is so general and so natural, that it presents itself at every moment, even in the least important acts of human justice . . . The Protestants have disputed it with us, as if the Redemption which they adore as well as we, was anything but a great indulgence granted to the human race through the infinite merits of Innocence, in the most eminent sense, that was voluntarily sacrificed for them. As Redemption is only a great Indulgence, an indulgence is only a diminished redemption."

In fact between Redemption and Indulgence there appear to be remarkable analogies, which we shall point out in conclusion.

In consideration of the satisfactions of Jesus Christ, and provided that we fulfill the conditions required for our justification, the stain of sin is effaced, the eternal penalty is remitted. Such is the work of our redemption. The foundation of this mystery is, as you see, the transferableness of the satisfaction of the God-Man, to the penitent, when he is disposed to receive this favor by the cooperation required on his part in Baptism or Penance.

This first work being effected in a christian who, having fallen after his Baptism, returns laboriously to Penance, we are now concerned with the bringing it to

perfection. The sinner thus justified may still be indebted before God, and liable to suffer long and painful punishment in this world or in the life to come. To assist him in discharging this debt, the divine goodness, by the instrumentality of the Church, grants an Indulgence, and thereby, in consideration always of the superabundant satisfactions of Jesus Christ, the punishment, no longer eternal but temporal, is remitted on determinate conditions, no longer by the Saviour Himself directly, but by those whom he has invested with the power of binding or loosing sinners, of remitting or retaining sins, and of exercising the ministry of reconciliation in His name.

Thus it is that Indulgences have Redemption for their type, their principle and their model. This analogy may be made more tangible by a comparison:

At the prayer of Martha and Mary our Saviour recalls His friend Lazarus from the tomb; here we have an image of our Redemption, which, by the power of Jesus Christ restores us from the death of sin to the life of grace. But Lazarus has risen still covered with the bandages which kept him enveloped in his shroud; and Jesus orders the Apostles to set him free from these bands: *Loose him and let him go.*[1] So the justified sinner has come forth from his tomb: but not free from all trammels, and still owing divers temporal penalties to the divine justice; and the Apostolic Church is at at hand to make those bands fall off, as soon as she judges it fit, by granting him an indulgence: *Loose him and let him go.*

When will this offer of deliverance, of cure, of resurrection be accepted by our separate brethren? The schism began on the occasion of an Indulgence, it is reasonable that on the occasion and by the aid of the most precious of Indulgences it should come to an end. And yet how many times, during three centuries, has this plank of succor been thrown out in vain among these unfortunate shipwrecked men! How many times have these prodigal

[1] Joan. xi. 44.

sons heard, but heard unmoved, the voice of their father calling them back to the bosom of his family, and promising them pardon! When the Sovereign of the Roman States granted a liberal amnesty to political prisoners and exiles, they cheered, and greeted Pius IX. by the name of father and deliverer; they bore him in triumph. They read again and again, with the most tender emotions, those beautiful words: "A feeling of pain embitters all our joys, when we think of the numerous families, who are bearing the largest share of the punishment incurred by some one of their members, that had before now revolted against our authority; when we turn an eye of compassion on those inexperienced young men, who have allowed themselves to be caught by the bait of deceitful flatterers, and whose fault is not so much that of seducing as of having been seduced."[1] Then they said, and why should we accuse them of insincerity?—they said to us: "Oh, if you always had Pontiffs gifted with souls so good, we should soon be all on your side." Well, now the same Pius IX., successor of Peter, vicar of Jesus Christ, addresses himself directly to them; it is to these same christians, deeply involved in guilt, debtors before God, slaves of sin, banished from heaven, that he accords in the name of the Saviour, whose patience and kindness he so vividly exemplifies, the most generous, the most precious amnesty! An amnesty, not of the prince, but of the Pontiff. An amnesty which delivers not the body but the soul, and restores citizens not to an earthly country, but to the church and to heaven! Will they profit by it? . . . Let us still hope it; this consolation would so touch the heart of Pius IX.; so many other marvels are being accomplished in his reign; and the completion of the cathedral of Cologne, the re-establishment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in England and in Holland, the building of Notre Dame of Geneva, the erection of the Statue of Notre Dame of France, would serve so well for a memorial of this happy return!

[1] Decree of amnesty, July 16, 1846.

IV.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION (*continued.*)

DECEMBER 4, 1563.

Decree concerning Indulgences.

Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church; and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power,[1] delivered unto her of God; the sacred holy Synod teaches, and enjoins, that the use of Indulgences, for the Christian people, most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert, that they are useless; or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. In granting them, however, It desires that, in accordance with the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed; lest, by excessive facility, ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And being desirous that the abuses which have crept therein, and by occasion of which this honorable[2] name of Indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, be amended and corrected; It ordains generally by this decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof,—whence a most prolific cause of abuses amongst the Christian people has been derived,—be wholly abolished. But as regards the other abuses which have proceeded from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from whatsoever other source, since, by reason of the manifold corruptions in the places and provinces where the said abuses are committed, they cannot conveniently be especially prohibited; It commands all bishops, diligently to collect, each in his own church, all abuses of this nature, and to report them in the first provincial Synod; that, after having been reviewed bythe opinions of the other bishops also, they may forthwith be referred to the Sovereign Roman Pontiff, by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the universal Church will be ordained; that thus the gift of holy Indulgences may be dispensed to all the faithful, piously, holily, and incorruptly.

[1] Hujusmodi potestate, this kind of power. [2] Insigne, excellent.

CHAPTER TWENTIETH.

On the Worship and Invocation of the Virgin and the Saints. On Relics, Images, &c.

Twenty-fifth Session.

I.

In what the worship which we pay to the Saints consists. Justification of this worship from Scripture and Tradition.

"Honor thy father and thy mother,"[1] is the command alike of the natural and the divine law. This *honor* is an "external testimony paid to the excellence of persons, on whom God has bestowed His gifts." It is expressed by signs of veneration and confidence suggested by nature and variously modified by custom. There is not a man in the world, who does not pay some honor to his parents, and his superiors, spiritual or temporal.

With all the more reason are these testimonies of reverence due to those whom God has Himself favored with some supernatural gift. "Behold I will send my angel, who shall go before thee . . . honor him and hear his voice."[2] Jesus Christ said to His Apostles: "He that heareth you, heareth me, . . . he that despiseth you, despiseth me. . . . He that receiveth you receiveth me."[3] "O God," exclaimed King David of old, "to me Thy friends are made exceedingly honorable!"[4] And in the new law, St. James testifies that "we count them blessed who have endured," or suffered patiently for God.[5] But as "none is good (of himself) but God alone,"[6] and "every perfect gift cometh down from him;"[7] it follows, that all

[1] Exod. xx. 12. [2] Exod. xxiii. 21.
[3] Luc. x. 16; Matth. x. 40. [4] Ps. cxxxviii. 17.
[5] Jacob. v. 11. [6] Luc. xviii. 19. [7] Jacob. i. 17.

testimony which we give by external reverence to the excellence of a created being, ought, in order that it shall be just and true, to be referred ultimately to the Creator; and it is of this that our Saviour reminds us, when He says; "Call no one your father upon earth . . . neither be ye called masters," . . . for you have all but one Father, but one Master, "who is in heaven."[1] This is what the Apostle also recommends in the words: "Be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh," not as to men, "but as to Christ;"[2] and by those others, that God will be "glorified and honored in His saints."[3]

And it is what the family of Tobias did, when the Angel Raphael disclosed himself to their view; all prostrated themselves with their faces to the ground, and remained three hours in this posture of humiliation, occupied in blessing God.[4] But if it happened that any misguided men addressed to a created being the worship of adoration which is reserved to the Creator, that being would be exceedingly culpable, if he did not at once reject such idolatry, exclaiming with Paul and Barnabas, when they were taken for Mercury and Jupiter: "O ye men, why do ye these things? We also are mortals, men like unto you, preaching to you to be converted from these things to the living God."[5]

To recognize thus in every created being the gift of God, by going up to the supreme Giver, is what reason and faith require, and what no one can refuse without offending against justice and truth. This principle is indisputable. It is sufficient to justify the honors which the Church has at all times paid to the persons of her saints, "in whom especially God shows Himself wonderful."[6] She has never ceased to teach with Jesus Christ, that this homage ought to terminate in God, and to point out to her children the difference which separates absolute adoration, or the worship of *latria*, which is due to

[1] Matth. xxiii. 9, 10. [2] Ephes. vi. 7. [3] 2 Thess. i. 10.
[4] Tob. xii 22. [5] Act. xiv. 14. [6] Ps. lxvii. 36.

God alone, from the honor which with a view to Him we pay to His most worthy representatives. This latter worship is called *Dulia*, (δουλεύειν, to serve) when it is addressed to the saints, *Hyperdulia* when it is paid to the most perfect and most honored of created beings, to Mary.

The object of our worship is not only the person, whom God has blessed with his gifts, natural or supernatural. Every thing which makes that person, in a manner, *present* to us, receives a portion of the testimony, which we render to his excellence, in order to its transmission to the one represented. Thus the people of a kingdom honor the king in his messengers, his ministers, his arms, his effigies. Every man sees his father still in his mortal remains, his tomb, his portrait. Charlemagne's sword reveals his conquests, the hand of justice of St. Louis shows him to us judging his people with impartial equity; the eagle of Napoleon reminds us of his rapid victories. Why depart from all our habits when things are concerned which bring before us, as if truly present, persons most justly venerated? Why cease to honor Jesus or Mary in the objects that represent them?

It is true that the Lord said to the Hebrews: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any sculptured image."[1] But we cannot, without dishonesty, separate these words from the context, which explains them. The intention of the commandment is, first of all, expressed in these words: "Thou shalt not have strange gods before me."[2] It is idolatry then which is forbidden; and immediately the legislator adds: "Thou shalt not adore, thou shalt not serve" these representations of created things; "for I am the Lord thy God, jealous (of My glory), visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me.[3] Evidently it is the worship of false gods, or idolatry, which this law reprobates as the greatest of iniquities. The third and fifth verses explain the fourth, which, taken by itself and

[1] Exod. xx. 4. [2] Exod. xx. 3. [3] Exod. xx. 5.

literally, would interdict, as great crimes, sculpture, painting, drawing, the making of astronomical, geographical, geological charts, etc. Good sense, as well as the authority of the Church, tells us, that there is a distinction to be made here.—To have a temple, an ark of the covenant, tables of the law, a pot filled with manna, a brazen serpent, the cherubim of the propitiatory, and similar signs, which remind us of the presence of the Lord, is not to have strange gods before Him. Otherwise the Divine Legislator would be contradicting Himself. Every image then is not an idol, nor is every manifestation of reverence an act of adoration. This distinction is approved by the second Council of Nice, which anathematizes all who allege against the holy images the sentences pronounced in Scripture against idols, or who call the holy images *idols*.[1] The third Council of Lateran, under Gregory II., and the Council of Francfort, under Pope Stephen, declared themselves in the same sense. St. Gregory[2] explains very well how a likeness of our Saviour recalls the mysteries of His life and death. . St. John Damascene,[3] St. Theodore Studite[4] St. Plato, monk of Constantinople, defended the worship of holy images against the Iconoclasts. The martyrology honors a great number of saints *qui pro cultu sanctarum imaginum egregie decertarunt.* Baronius cites Theodore and Theophanes (ad. an. 825). Pagi cites Methodius (ad. an. 832). The Bollandists cite several others.

Throughout our sacred books the *name* of God is used for God Himself. Christians and Jews venerate these *books* as the very Word of God. In the ancient law we see the *ark*,[5] the *tables* of Moses, the *rod* of Aaron, the *golden cherubim* placed in the tabernacle,[6] the brazen *serpent*,[7] the *bones* of Joseph,[8] the *tomb* of Eliseus,[9] treated

[1] Conc. Nicoenum II, Act. vii. [2] *Epist.* liv, l. vii ad Secundin.
[3] *De fide orthodoxa.* [4] Stelitetica, c. *Iconoclastas.*
[5] Josue, vii. 6. [6] Exod. xxv. 18. [7] Num. xxi. 8.
[8] Exod. xiii. 19. [9] IV Reg. xiii. 21.

with a religious honor, which was sanctified by miracles. Under the law of grace, the *hem* of Christ's garment, touched in faith, cured a woman suffering under a disease that was past remedy;[1] the *shadow* of Peter was sufficient to restore health to a great number of sick people;[2] the *linen* and *girdles*, which Paul had used were carried to the sick, who on touching them were healed.[3]

The *cross* of the Saviour, and the mere representation, the mere sign of the cross have been held in so great veneration ever since the Apostolic age, that Tertullian could write: "Every time we go in or out, when putting on our clothes or our shoes, at the bath, at the table, in lighting the lamps, on lying down in bed, on sitting down, in whatever occupation we are engaged we mark our forehead with the sign of the Cross."[4] Almost all the Fathers of the first centuries recount miracles wrought by this sign. The image of the cross, from the beginning, was to be exposed above the altar, where the unbloody sacrifice was offered, and that altar was the tomb of a martyr. Celsus, Julian, Cæcilius reproached the christians of their time with adoring the cross. "You ought not to bow down before the crosses," they said, "but to be nailed to them."[5] The acts of the martyrs of the primitive Church prove how zealously the christians collected the blood and bones of the confessors of the faith, the honors they paid to these sacred relics, which were preserved in gold and silk, kissed with veneration, and placed on the altars; as well as the numerous miracles, with which God was pleased to reward such piety.

A multitude of ancient monuments, collected by archæologists,[6] also attest, that the faithful of the early ages loved to represent on the vessels for the Sacrifice, on the rings they wore on their fingers, on tombs, lamps, glass,

[1] Matth. ix. 20.
[2] Act. v. 15.
[3] Act. xix. 12.
[4] *De Corona militis*, c. iii.
[5] Non adorandæ vobis, sed subeundæ cruces. *Cæcilius*, apud. Minuc. Felicem, *in Octavio*.
[6] Aringhi, Buonarotti, Boldetti, Ciampini, etc.

on the walls of their crypts and their chapels, Jesus the good Shepherd, Mary and her divine Son, the Angels, the holy Apostles. "In the catacombs of St. Calixtus, on the Appian way, the most ancient paintings have been discovered, representing Christ, and subjects derived from the Old and New Testaments, paintings which date back to the first or second century. The paintings discovered in the catacombs of St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana, appear to go back to the second and third centuries. Among the subjects collected by the author of *Rome Souterraine*, we remark Adam and Eve, Tobias and the Angel, Herod and the Magi, the Paralytic, &c. . . In the catacombs of St. Cyriacus, on the Via Tiburtina, a representation of the Virgin has been discovered, and the most ancient portraits known of St. Cecilia, St. Cyriacus, and St. Catharine, which date back to the third and fourth centuries. In the year 365, Pope Damasus caused the celebrated well *Platonica*, which for a time served as a tomb for St. Peter and St. Paul, to be adorned with frescoes. These frescoes represent our Lord and the Apostles."[1] Eusebius speaks of a statue representing our Saviour, erected by the woman, who had been cured by touching the hem of His garment.[2] There is preserved at the Vatican a statue of St. Hippolytus the martyr, which the learned assign to the times of Alexander Severus.

St. Theresa relates, in the nineteenth book of her life,

[1] Report of the minister of the Interior (Leon Fancher) on the request for a vote of credit for the publication of *La Rome Souterraine*, by M. Perret. In the catacombs of Priscilla, the Abbate Scognamiglio has discovered a fresco which artists and antiquaries of experience, among whom we may mention Count A. de Bastard, attribute to the last years of the first century, in the time of Diocletian. This fresco represents the Holy Family. The Virgin is seated, wearing a tunic without sleeves, and a very fine veil which falls no lower than her shoulders. She is giving the breast to the divine Babe. On her left stands a person of about five-and-thirty years of age, with a beard, and clothed in a pallium which allows the right shoulder to be seen. This person can be no other than St. Joseph. *Monde*, June 13, 1863.

[2] *Hist. Eccles.* l. vii. c. 18.

that it was to the sight of an image of Jesus suffering, that she owed the resolution she made to enter into the paths of sanctity, from which she never departed. "One day," she writes, "on etering my oratory, I saw an image representing Jesus covered with wounds. It was so full of devotion, so touching, it recalled in so vivid a way all that the Saviour had suffered for us, that the sight entirely overwhelmed me. At the view of those wounds, which my sins had so greatly enlarged, I was seized with a suffering like death; it seemed as if my heart was being torn out; I threw myself at the feet of my Jesus, and pouring forth abundant tears, entreated Him to give me once for all the strength never to offend Him more .... This circumstance of my life inspired me with a great love for pious pictures. Most unhappy, alas! are those heretics, who regard them with horror, and who by their own fault are deprived of one great means of instruction and edification. We see clearly that they do not love their Lord; for if they loved him, would they not take pleasure in contemplating His features? Do not those who love each other in this world find happiness in dwelling on the portrait of the beloved one?"

II.

On the invocation of Saints, and the grounds which authorize it.

But we *invoke* the saints? Yes, we may do that, in order that they may ask with us and for us, in the name of Jesus Christ, what of themselves they have not power to grant, and what God is pleased to bestow on us in consideration of their prayers, which are more perfect than ours. How many reasons are there to persuade us to do this!

The saints have made themselves acceptable to God, most especially by their charity. This virtue, which they carried even to the heroism of the most sublime devotedness, seeks incessantly to be active and benevolent. Harken how it expresses itself on earth: "I wished to be anathema

from Christ for my brethren." "Who is weak and I am not weak? Who is scandalized, and I am not on fire" with grief and zeal? "I became a Jew with the Jews, a Gentile with the Gentiles; I became all things to all men, that I might save all."[1]

Now, must this charity, on being perfected in heaven, become at once and for ever powerless and indifferent? Must it lose its fervor and its insatiable activity, when it is in the bosom of God? Who could believe this? And in what respect would the extinction of that sacred fire contribute to the glory of Jesus Christ? But if charity, lighted up in our hearts by His grace, receives its fullest expansion in the life of glory, it follows necessarily that the blessed still love, and love ever more and more, their brethren of the Church militant; that they pray for them, and that their prayer is not in vain.

It happened one day that he who was called the great king Assuerus, wishing worthily to recompense a person from whom he had received a signal service, but whom he had long forgotten, called his first minister and said: "What ought to be done to the man, whom the king is desirous to honor?"[2] Haman, with views by no means disinterested, replied: "The man, whom the king desireth to honor, ought to be clothed with the king's apparel, and to be set upon the horse that the king rideth upon, and to have the royal crown upon his head; and let the first of the king's princes and nobles hold his horse, and going through the streets of the city, proclaim before him, and say: Thus shall he be honored whom the king hath a mind to honor." . . If the ambition of men solicits such recompenses from the princes of earth, what shall the charity of the saints ask of God as the reward of their sacrifices? Undoubtedly the power of still doing good, of still saving souls, a great number of souls.

But let us see what Jesus Christ has Himself promised

[1] Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 22. [2] Esther, vi. 6.

them. He calls the good servant, who has been faithful in the least things, to exercise over cities and peoples, a power proportioned in its extent to the number of talents, which he has turned to good account.[1] He promises to make those who have triumphed over the enemies of salvation sit with Him upon His throne.[2] He wills that they should be seated on thrones from which with Him they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel.[3] He declares that the conversion of a sinner causes great joy in heaven.[4] He exhorts us to endeavor by our good works to gain the friendship of the saints, that they may introduce us into everlasting dwellings.[5] He employs His good angels, as Raphael, to receive our prayers, our tears, our alms in order to present them to Him.[6] In a word, that glory which the Father gives to the Son, the Son communicates to His elect.[7] Thus the saints are associated to all eternity in that sublime ministry which the Son of God ceases not to exercise, at His Father's right hand, for the interest of our salvation. They therefore merit our prayers as well as our reverence.

This twofold homage has always been paid them, in the old law as well as the new. Judas Maccabeus, wishing to reanimate the courage of his countrymen against the persecution of Nicanor, relates a vision which the inspired book calls "worthy to be believed;" He had seen the holy High priest, Onias, stretching out his hands in supplication towards God, and begging grace and mercy for Israel. Then Onias, showing him a venerable person resplendent with glory, said to him: "This is a lover of his brethren and of the people of God; this is he, that prayeth much for the people and all the holy city, Jeremias the prophet of the Lord." On this "Jeremias had stretched forth his right hand, and given Judas a golden sword, saying: Take this sword, a gift from God, where-

[1] Luc. xix. 16. [2] Apoc. iii. 21. [3] Matth. xix. 28.
[4] Luc. xv. [5] Luc. xvi. 9. [6] Tob. xii.
[7] Joan. xvii. 22.

with thou shalt overthrow the adversaries of my people Israel."[1]

The prophet Zacharias hears an angel pray for Israel in these words: "O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, with which thou hast been angry so long?"[2] And immediately afterwards the Lord comforts this angel by granting his prayer, and promises to give again to Jerusalem the abundance of his mercies.[3]

Daniel prays with tears to obtain the return of his people from captivity; to his prayers he joins fasting and the rigors of penance. An angel comes on the part of the Lord to console him, to assure him that his prayers aided by his austerities, by the intervention of Michael, the patron of God's people, and by his own intercession, have at last been granted. There were still many obstacles to be surmounted on earth and in heaven, "and none is my helper in these things," said the angel, "but Michael your prince."[4]

A multitude of other passages show that the angels and saints serve God as His ministers in the execution of His counsels, and are appointed as guardians over individuals, cities and empires.[5]

St. John, the prophet of the new law, saw in heaven four and twenty ancients prostrate before the Lamb, each of them presenting to Him golden vials full of odors. Now these odors, he says, are the prayers of the saints.[6]

Still more. The gospel shows us Abraham invoked by the rich man buried in hell;[7] as if the damned themselves recognized the power of the intercession of the blessed.

But, even during their pilgrimage through this life the saints do not pray in vain for their brethren. St. Paul wrote to the Romans: "I beseech you brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God."[8]

[1] 2 Macc. xv. 12-16. [2] Zach. i. 12. [3] Zach. i. 16. [4] Dan. x.
[5] Dan. vii. 10; III Reg. xxii. 19; Ps. cl. 1; Ps. lxvii. 36, etc.
[6] Apoc. v. 8. [7] Luc. xvi. 24. [8] Rom. xv. 30.

And to the Ephesians: "Watching with all instance and supplication for all the saints,"[1] that is for all the faithful. "Pray for us,"[2] was his request to the christians of Thessalonica. "Pray one for another, that you may be saved," said St. James, "for the continual prayer of a just man availeth much."[3]

Now, if the prayer of a just man, while he is still away from God and exposed to perish in this valley of tears, is yet so efficacious that the greatest of the Apostles asks it, as a condition of success for his ministry, what are we to think of the prayer of one of the blessed established in glory? Is it possible that in passing from earth to heaven, from the kingdom of death to the empire of life, from the abode of sin to the very heart of infinite charity, the Apostle should at once have lost all love for mankind his brethren, and all power of helping them before God? In that case the kindom of God would be the realm of selfishness! The splendor of light would make the saints blind! The torrent of delight, by drinking of which the saints are filled with joy, would be the river of Lethe! And the full opening of the perfect and blessed life would be the annihilation of the noblest sentiments and the most precious faculties of human nature!

"From the very beginning," says M. Gerbet, "prayer has been the fulfilment of the two great duties, which form the summary of the whole law, an act of adoration and love towards God, an act of love towards our neighbor. We see the Apostles declaring in their epistles that they pray without ceasing for the faithful; we see the faithful, in accordance with their instruction and their example, pray one for another; and at the same time that it was a work of charity to pray to God for a brother, it was on that brother's part an act of pious humility to ask this assistance, as an alms for his poor soul. Hence the usage, so universally diffused from the first ages, of recommending ourselves to each other's prayers. As reason and

[1] Ephes, vi. 18. [2] 1 Thess. v. 25. [3] Jacob. v. 16.

the Gospel teach that prayer is better in the eyes of God, in proportion as the heart, from which it ascends, is pure and inflamed with love, it necessarily followed, that persons recommended themselves with more confidence and eagerness to the prayers of those choice souls, whose superior virtues made them shine forth as more perfect images of Christ. . . . . This special eagerness to recur to the prayers of the most fervent christians was founded on the two grounds, that they were at once more powerful friends of God and more charitable friends of men. Must this order of things be changed, when these souls have quitted the earth? Was this spiritual attraction, which drew men to them as to the warmest focus of christian prayer, to be arrested by the stone of their sepulchre? Evidently the very opposite ought to happen. The grace of God's friendship and of charity towards their brethren, weak and frail as it was, while journeying through this land of trial, having become perfect and incorruptible, they themselves became more powerful and more loving, that is to say, more *prayable*, if I may be allowed to use such a word. When a glorious transfiguration has been accomplished in them, how can we conceive, that in consequence a transformation of the very opposite character must be produced in the piety of the faithful, the effect of which should be the extinguishing of confidence and prayer, as if those holy souls instead of ascending to glory had sunk into non-existence? To think it well to recommend ourselves to the prayers of saints *on earth*, to forbid this devotion towards the saints *in heaven*, is exactly as if you would say to a poor man: You may ask alms of those, who have a few hundreds a year, which they are liable to lose, but you are not to beg of those who have tens of thousands, of which the possession is secured to them."[1]

It would be a very superfluous labor to seek new proofs in support of a truth so clearly demonstrated. I cannot,

[1] Université catholique, t. vii. p. 408.

however, pass entirely in silence that, which is derived from the liturgies.

The liturgy called St. James', contains this prayer: "We commemorate especially the holy and glorious and ever-virgin Mary, mother of God: Remember her, O Lord, and by her pure and holy prayers, spare us; have mercy upon us and grant our prayers."

Similar prayers are found in the liturgies ascribed to St. Mark, in that of St. John Chrysostom, in the *Ordo Romanus*, in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, and in the most ancient Missals and Euchologies.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem explains the meaning of these prayers addressed to saints, in his fifth mystical catechetic: "Then we commemorate those who have already fallen asleep, first Patriarchs, Apostles, Martyrs, that, through their prayers and intercessions, God may receive our supplication."

And St. Augustin: "We do not count our martyrs as gods; we do not worship them as gods; we do not build temples or altars to them nor offer them sacrifices: God forbid! All these things are given to God; all are offered to God. When we offer the sacrifice in the churches of the martyrs, do we not offer it to God? When did you ever hear it said by any priest, I offer to thee, O Peter, or, I offer to thee, O Paul? You have not heard it. It is not done. It is not allowed.[1]" And again: "Whatever religious services are performed in the churches of the martyrs, are honors to their memory, not sacred rites and sacrifices offered to the dead as if they were gods."[2]

Our adversaries admit that since the fourth century the Fathers have been unanimous in recognizing the invocation of saints as pious and useful. The Council of Chalcedon, the third of Constantinople, the second of Nice, declared themselves in favor of this ancient belief. But long before this period, Origen had said, in speaking of

[1] *Serm.* 293, al. 101. *De Diversis.*

[2] *De Civ. Dei.* l. viii. c. 27, where the above passage is repeated.

angels and saints: "They co-operate with those who wish to serve the God, who is above all things, and propitiate Him, and pray with them and supplicate with them."[1]

And St. Cyprian had written to his friend Cornelius: "Let us ever pray for one another, . . . and which ever of us shall first depart hence, let our love continue when before the Lord, and let not our prayer for our brethren and sisters cease in presence of the Lord's mercy."[2] Lastly, Eusebius, in speaking of the sepulchres of the saints, had said: "It is our custom to go to their tombs, and to offer up our prayers beside them, honoring their blessed souls; and these things are with good reason done by us."[3]

The Synagogue from the earliest times, says M. Drach,[4] has had recourse to the intercession of those of the dead whom it regards as saints, and asks the same aid of prayers from the angels.

III.

Justification of the worship of honor, and invocation paid to Mary.[5]

We may, consequently, honor and invoke the saints, but this honor and these prayers are above all due to the Virgin Mary, Mother of God.

Honor is a testimony rendered to the excellence of merit. Now, Mary has the merit, excellent no doubt in the eyes of every christian in the world, of being, by virtue of the divine election and her own consent, the mother, the worthy mother, the chosen and beloved mother of the God-Man.

The archangel assuredly paid this honor to Mary, in saluting her. So ought all those generations to do, who,

[1] *Cont. Cels.* l. viii. n. 64. [2] *Epist.* lvii.

[3] *De Præp. Evang.* l. xiii. c. 11.

[4] De l'harmonie de l'Eglise et de la Synagogue, t. i. p. 16.

[5] See the work entitled De Hyperdulia ejusque fundamento—auctore F. Haine, Lovani, 1864.

according to her prediction, *shall call her blessed.* How shall we imagine that we are dispensed from this pious duty, which angels and men are eager to perform!

The disciples, invited to Cana enjoyed the fruits of the powerful intercession of Mary. The beloved disciple esteemed himself most happy in receiving her as his mother; the Apostles assembled in the cænacle took care to unite their prayers with hers. How far then are christians gone astray who would understand Christianity differently from the Apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ!

Besides, what ought a Christian, a true Christian to be?—In his thoughts, his feelings, his actions, another Christ. Now with what respect, with what love did Jesus Christ constantly treat His mother!

The whole of Catholic tradition is full of the praises of Mary. Since the first ages our religion has never ceased to invoke her. Again then let us ask, would not he be presumptuous who should dare to reform the teaching and practice of all the Fathers, all the Doctors, all the Pontiffs, all the Saints of the Church?

We shall not quote their words here. They would fill volumes.[1] We shall content ourselves with appealing to two authorities which have more weight with our adversaries: Scripture and the first reformers.

Our holy books show us the Virgin Mary united to Jesus in the original promise of a Redeemer;[2] in the oracles of the prophets, especially Isaiah,[3] Jeremiah,[4] Micajah;[5] in the figures of the old law;[6] in the expectation of the nations.[7]

When the great mystery of the Incarnation is about to be accomplished in her womb, the Gospel tells us in what terms of veneration the heavenly messenger comes to solicit her consent; "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women! Fear not, Mary,

[1] See especially Canisius *De Deipara.*
[2] Genes. iii. 15.
[3] Isai. xlv. 8.
[4] Jerem. xxxi. 22.
[5] Mich. v. 3.
[6] Sap. ix; Dan. ii. 34, etc.
[7] Joan. vii. 42.

for thou hast found grace with God. Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David, his father, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob, his father, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."[1] Majestic eulogium, inspired and uttered by Heaven, of the Virgin full of grace, and the Mother, in whom was reflected all the glory of her Son!

But the Virgin has made an engagement with God, which she could not break for all the glories of heaven and earth. Gabriel must therefore enter into fuller explanations: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God,[2] of that God, with whom nothing is impossible."[3] The humble Virgin replied: "Behold the hand-maid of the Lord, be it done to me according to thy word."[4] And at that instant, Mary is in the most true sense, *Mother of God!* The Emmanuel lives with her life, breathes with her breath, is flesh of her flesh, and bone of her bones; and while the virginal flesh and immaculate blood of Mary become the flesh and blood of the God-Man, the thoughts and the divine virtues of Jesus seem to diffuse themselves in Mary.

Accordingly when she hastens over the mountains, to carry to the heart of His Precursor the thrillings of supernatural joy, what a superhuman intelligence of the counsels of God in the mystery of Redemption is revealed to us in her hymn of gratitude!

"My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

"Because he hath regarded the humility of His handmaid; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

[1] Luc. i. 28-33. [2] Luc. i. 35. [3] Luc. i. 37. [4] Luc. i. 38.

"Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me: and holy is His name.

"And His mercy is from generation unto generation to them that fear Him.

"He hath showed might in His arm: He hath scattered the proud in the conceit of their heart.

"He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble.

"He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich He hath sent empty away.

"He hath received Israel His servant, being mindful of His mercy: as He spoke to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed for ever!"[1]

Let us not doubt it. She who understands so well the divine intentions in the mystery that is accomplished in her, has her soul so perfectly united to the soul of Jesus, that according to the prophecy of Simeon, she will be pierced by the sword which shall open the heart of her divine Son.[2] To make this union ever more and more perfect, she applies herself during thirty years to *keep and to ponder in her heart the words* which flow from the lips of the Incarnate Word.[3] It is therefore to Mary most particularly that the blessedness belongs, which was proclaimed by Jesus Christ to be greater than her divine maternity: "Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it!"[4]

When the hour was come that the Son of God should enter upon His Apostolical career, He was willing to grant to the solicitation of Mary, that miracle of which St. John speaks as the "beginning of the miracles wrought by Jesus, which manifested His glory, and caused His disciples to believe in Him."[5]

Thus, according to Scripture, Mary lived with Jesus for four thousand years in the oracles of the prophets and the expectation of the nations; she gave Jesus, because she

[1] Luc. i. 46. [2] Luc. ii. 25. [3] Luc. ii. 19 and 51.
[4] Luc. xi. 28. [5] Joan. ii. 11.

willed to do it, His natural life; she was enriched by all the treasures of His Hidden Life: and it was to her intervention that the miracle was accorded, which signalized the entering of Jesus on His public life.

Still more. When the Saviour of mankind willed to merit by His bloody death His own resurrection and ours, and that glorious and eternal life, which He is to share with us in heaven, He associated His mother in this great sacrifice. We see on Calvary something more than Abraham offering his son Isaac, and by the greatness of his faith and fortitude meriting that his only, his beloved son should still live, and that a posterity should be born to him more numerous than the stars of heaven and the sands of the sea[1] . . . . We see the Mother of Jesus, Mary, standing by the cross, sprinkled by the blood of her Son, giving up to the justice of God her only, her beloved one, and obtaining by her magnanimity and the immensity of her sorrow, to which no other sorrow is to be compared, that after three days her Son should be restored to her, glorious and immortal, and that we ourselves, being made her children, should have a mother in her.

Yes, according to St. Bernardine of Sienna, Dionysius the Carthusian, Hugh of St. Victor, and others, the beloved disciple represented at the foot of the cross all christians. In him and with him we have received for our mother, the Mother of Jesus. Thus Mary in the cænacle fulfils the office of a mother, when she draws down on the Apostles, and disciples, by the fervor of her prayers, that Creator Spirit, who is the life of the Church.[3]

This is what the Scriptures teach us of Mary. And if, on one or two occasions, He, who said to Peter, "Go behind Me, Satan! thou art a scandal to Me;"[4] and to His beloved disciple, "You know not of what spirit you are,"[5] appears to see in Mary an ordinary woman rather than a mother, the reason is that He wished to show His disci-

[1] Genes. xxii. [2] Joan. xix. 27. [3] Act. i. 14.
[4] Matth. xvi. 23. [5] Luc. ix. 55.

ples, how they ought to rise above all natural affections, in the exercise of their Apostolic functions. However, so far is the Saviour from regarding His Mother's presence or prayer as inopportune, that each time He grants her all she asks. At the age of twelve years Jesus follows her to Nazareth ; at the marriage of Cana He works His first miracle; dying on the cross He entrusts her to the disciple, whom He loves above all the others.

Thus has Jesus Christ Himself condemned by His acts those, who see in the lessons of Apostolic detachment and independence which He gives His ministers, reproaches or marks of indifference to His mother.

The glory of Mary is then firmly established on the basis of Scripture. The manner in which Tradition speaks of her is not less emphatic. Frescoes are found representing the Virgin Mother bearing her divine Son in her arms; and some of these paintings date from the beginning of the second century, or even the latter part of the first.

As soon as the Christians were able to come forth from the catacombs, they erected temples in honor of Mary. The most ancient church in Rome, which is not subterranean, is that of St. Mary beyond the Tiber, in the district called the Transtevere; its foundation dates from the third century, and tradition attributes it to Pope St. Calixtus.

St. Maria Maggiore dates from Constantine. St. Helena had decoroted the grotto of Bethlehem, and built a magnificent church at Gethsemani in honor of the Mother of God. Ravenna, Nocera and other cities already had churches dedicated to the Virgin. The first church, which St. Gregory Nazianzen built at Constantinople, was consecrated to her. Thus the practice of erecting temples in honor of the mother of God, and of venerating her image, is as old as the Church itself.[1]

[1] See the Dissertation of Dom Pitra on the worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, as it existed before the Council of Ephesus, in *L'Auxiliaire catholique*. 2d year, vol. iii.

If we penetrate into the interior of these temples, we hear the praises of Mary resounding there. The liturgies of the East, (the Armenian, those of St. James, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom,) the liturgies of the West (the Roman, the Ambrosian, the Mozarabic, the Gallican,) exalt to the utmost the august mother of God; call her *our Lady* and *our Queen*, attach glorious epithets to her name, make mention of her in a special and pre-eminent manner, even in the Canon of the Mass. Pope Vigilius says that the canon dates from the Apostolic age; in it we say every day: *Communicantes et memoriam venerantes imprimis gloriosæ semper Virginis Genitricis Dei Mariæ.*

The apocryphal gospels, the popular character of which is as indisputable as their high antiquity, show us that shortly after the death of the Blessed Virgin her memory was already held in great veneration. The name, *Mother of God*, was commonly given her, which the apostate Julian made a matter of reproach to the Catholics. Nestorius himself, in his fourth sermon, declares that his heresy was a reaction against the honors and exalted titles, which the christian people gave to Mary. St. Epiphanius, under a better inspiration, was obliged to place among the heresies which he refuted, the error of the Collyridians, who went so far as to give to the Virgin the worship due only to the Deity. "Let Mary be honored:—it is well. She is indeed a choice and excellent vessel: she has been most highly honored both in mind and body .... Let Mary indeed be held in honor; but let the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost be adored."

It is agreed by all the world that since the Council of Ephesus, the august mother of God has received the eulogiums of all the Fathers. But before that period Didymus of Alexandria, who taught St. Jerome and St. Ambrose, calls Mary "the immaculate Virgin, the most illustrious Virgin, worthy to be honored above all others."[1]

[1] *De Trinit.* l. iii. c. iv.

St. Ephrem, to whom a magnificent discourse on the praises of Mary is attributed, goes far beyond all, that her modern panegyrists have said of her. St. Methodius, whose learning and teaching are extolled by St. Epiphanius and St. Jerome, exalts the divine maternity of the august Virgin, and concludes his praises of her with this reflection: "Of a truth, these are the doctrines of all, who hold to the uncorrupted faith."[1] St. Augustine calls Mary, the dignity of the earth:[2] the mother not of Jesus Christ alone, but of all christians[3] . . spiritually the daughter of the Saviour; "sed plane mater membrorum ejus, quod nos sumus; quia coöperata est charitate ut fideles in ecclesia nascerentur quæ illius capitis membra sunt." "Besides, there is also here a great mystery, that since death came to us through a woman, life should be born to us through a woman; that the devil should be vanquished and tormented by both sexes, that is both male and female, since he rejoiced in causing the fall of both, and it would not have been so great a punishment for him had both sexes in us been freed, unless we had been freed through both."[4] St. Jerome, the great defender of the perpetual viginity of Mary, says that the other holy women, (as Anna and Elizabeth) are to Mary what the stars are to the sun.[5] "What is there more noble than the Mother of God?" exclaims St. Ambrose.[6] "What more splendid than she, who was chosen by splendor Itself? What more chaste than she, who continuing a virgin immaculate became a mother? And what shall I say of her other virtues?"

A Council held at Lyons, in 580, mentions the festival of the *Nativity*, of which St. John Damascene, of the Greek church, has left us the panegyric: the *Purification*, of which St. Gregory Nyssen and St. Cyril have explained the mystery; and the *Assumption*, celebrated by Sophro-

[1] Serm. *de Simeone et Anna et de Deipara.*
[2] *De vera Relig.* c. lv. n. 108.
[3] *De S. Virgin*, c. vi.
[4] *De Agone Christiano*, c. xxii. n. 24.
[5] *Comment. in Sophon. in Prologo.*
[6] *De Virgin*, l. ii.

nius. The feast of the *Annunciation*, had inspired St. Athanasius with eloquent discourses. The Venerable Bede speaks of the *Visitation*, and Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, of the *Presentation*.

But if some of our separated brethren still prefer to these precious instructions the lessons of the new Fathers, whom they have given themselves, we may remind them of these words of the precursors and leaders of the Reformation:

"Might it please God," says Erasmus, "that all christians were sufficiently devoted to the worship of Mary to endeavor to imitate her virtues."[1] And in another place he calls Mary the happy branch, that came of the stock of Jesse, the brilliant temple of the peace-loving Solomon, in which the King of heaven dwells, the most pure sanctuary, which has never been stained by sin.

John Huss has left these memorable words in his confession of faith: "I pray for my accusers to the most pure mother of the Saviour, the restorer of the human race, the Queen of Heaven, endowed with a nature altogether angelic, more happy, crowned with more glory, more abounding in gifts of grace than all the blessed, her Son alone excepted. Of her fullness, as St. Bernard says, we have all received; the sick, health, the afflicted, consolation! the Angels, joy; the Son of God, human nature; the Holy Trinity, honor and glory."

Luther himself said: "It is a pious belief that the conception of Mary was without sin. Mary holds as it were the middle place between Christ and mankind.[2] It was just and right that she should be preserved from original sin, she in whom Christ was to take a flesh superior to all sin. No woman has been, no woman will ever be as holy as Mary; no other has conceived without sin and without pleasure."[3]

"Mary is the most sublime of created beings," said Œolampadius, "she is the queen of the world; more than

[1] *In cap.* xi. *Matth.* [2] Cited by *Canisius.* [3] Serm. in *festiv. Deipara.*

any other has she been honored by our Lord, and there are scarcely any graces, which she has not obtained."[1]

"Willingly," says Calvin, "do we honor the Virgin Mary as our mistress, and follow her teaching and her precepts."[2] And Beza, "I believe piously and with full consent of my heart that Mary continued a virgin till her death."[3]

And has not Mahomet himself, in the twenty-first chapter of his Koran, written thus: "Sing the glory of Mary, who preserved her virginity unimpaired. We breathe our Spirit upon her. She and her Son are the admiration of the universe."[4]

[1] The subject of one of his sermons is that God is to be praised in Mary.

[2] *De Reform. Eccles.* Serm. ii.

[3] *Preface to the New Testament.*

[4] It is a doctrine contained in Scripture, (Matth. i. 18-20; Luc. i. 34; Isai. vii.) and at all times proclaimed by tradition, that Mary preserved her virginity unimpaired before as well as during her child-bearing. It is the view of St. Justin, and of St. Iræneus, who takes pains to prove the true sense of the words of Isaiah: *Behold a Virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son*, against Theodosian and Aquila: in this he is imitated by Tertullian. Origen declares that Jesus Christ's birth of a virgin is an essential point of the faith. St. Methodius of Tyre calls Mary the Virgin-Mother. This permanent virginity of Mary is recognized by St. Hippolytus, by Eusebius, by St. Amphilochius, by St. Gregory of Nysso, by St. Gregory Nazianzen, by St. Ephrem, Theodoret, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Jerome....

That Mary did not cease to be a virgin after bearing her child, we have the proof in the epithet "*ever Virgin*" (semper Virgo), which we find in tradition joined to the title of Mother of God, as well as in the declarations of the symbols of the faith (Apostles' and Nicene Creeds) in the writings of the Fathers, and the acts of Councils, in which she is named solemnly and simply *the Virgin*. Later on, we meet with a multitude of expressions to this effect, in St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and others. As to the passage of St. Matthew: *And he knew her not till she brought forth her first-born son*, i. 25, the Fathers reply with St. Jerome, that it means only that this had not taken place before the birth, and does not at all imply that it had taken place afterwards. As to the *brethren* of Jesus, who are repeatedly mentioned in Scripture, it is generally admitted, that by these words we must understand the children of the Holy Virgin's sisters. The ancients call almost all those brethren, who were relations in the collateral line, as uncle and nephew, cousinger-

IV.

Practice of the worship of the Saints. Advantages which result from it.

For the better appreciation of the advantages which the Church derives from the worship she gives to the blessed, it is sufficient to call to mind how she proceeds in the establishment of this worship and in the practice of it.

A worker of miracles, an Apostle, a bishop after God's own heart, a confessor mighty in deeds and in words, a Charles Borromeo, a Francis Xavier, a Vincent of Paul, . . . is sent on earth to translate into living examples, the teachings of the Saviour of mankind. The servant of God, like his Master, has passed over the earth in doing good.

Already the Lord seems to manifest by miracles both the sanctity of His chosen one and the power of his intercession. The confidence and veneration of the people increase daily.

Nevertheless the Church waits for years; she opposes a long and discouraging resistance to the eagerness of the faithful. The least sign of religious worship given prematurely to this benefactor of mankind, whose prayer is visibly acceptable to God, would prove an insurmountable obstacle to the honors demanded for him.

She examines with wise deliberation, with unheard of severity, his writings, his sayings, his actions, his institutions, his virtues, the proofs of his martyrdom, the reality of the wonders attributed to his intercession. All the depositions are taken, the greatest publicity is given to these discussions, to which it will be necessary to return after many years of waiting, and to return a second time,

man, etc. This is proved not only by a great number of passages of the Old Testament (Genes. xiii. 8; xxix. 15, etc.), but also by the custom of profane writers. The *Dictionaire de Trevoux* cites Cicero, Ovid, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, etc.

and maintain an opposition so malignant and obstinate, that it has been called *satanic*.

After half a century and more of delays, his writings, examined by several theologians, have been judged irreproachable, his virtues heroic, some of the facts miraculous. The worship so long interdicted, has first been permitted in some one locality, or to a particular congregation; it has afterwards become catholic. One day of the year has been chosen, which will be to the end of time the feast-day of St. Charles Borromeo or St. Vincent of Paul.

The most edifying circumstances, verified in the process of the canonization, will furnish the elements of the saint's Office; and the prayers and lessons will again be submitted to a severe examination before being admitted into the liturgy. For the instruction and edification of the faithful, particular lives will be composed, submitted to the approval of the bishops and to the wise rules of Urban VIII. and of the Roman Inquisition. At the same time, however, the Church does not determine anything definitively, as to the authenticity of these facts, even though they should be recounted in the legends or hymns of the Breviary.

To prepare for the festival of one of these glorious protectors, we pray, sometimes we consecrate the preceding day to abstinence and fasting, we confess our sins. On the day itself we assist at the divine mysteries, which are celebrated with more than ordinary splendor; we receive the holy Eucharist; we meditate on the virtues of the blessed saint, which are related in the lessons of the Office, and are published at the altar, chanted in pious hymns, engraven on brass, represented in painting, celebrated from the pulpit in a panegyric, in which we are continually reminded that the best homage we can render to him is the imitation of his virtues. If the day is one of rest, some seemly recreations will come after our

prayers, and will take the place of labor. Such is, briefly, the worship we pay to the saints.

And if in any place these solemnities degenerate into tumultuous gatherings and profane feastings, if false miracles are related, unauthorized relics venerated; if it happen that an ill-informed person attributes to his patron a power that belongs only to God, the Church exclaims against these inevitable abuses, she redoubles her care and vigilance to prevent them, she diminishes the number of festivals on which labor is suspended, she condemns all vain observances, all false and superstitious belief, but she preserves true and legitimate worship. And it is not Heaven alone which sanctions it, by the graces bestowed, the miracles wrought, the sensible favors diffused around during those bright days; all right-minded and elevated souls on earth must agree with us that nothing is more worthy, more moral, more salutary.

Is not virtue taught especially by examples? Here examples, chosen by God Himself, are taken from all conditions, all ages and all climates. The most obscure walks of life frequently offer the most distinguished models, reverenced with most honor; and Paris will long continue to venerate a shepherdess as her patron, Madrid an humble laborer, Lucca a poor servant-girl. These examples, it is true, are those of the Saviour Himself, but reproduced in frail mortals, sinners like ourselves; examples placed within the reach of our weakness, brought home to our misery, taken from our own country, our own times, perhaps our own family.

What a holy emulation ought the spectacle of these glorious triumphs, every day renewed and varied, to excite in our minds! The sight of all those heroes, who, having themselves, by their victories, won the kingdom of heaven, now one after another appear to us from the midst of their splendors and say: Courage! we were once what you now are, you can become what we are. To the

brave who learn to master themselves the conquest of heaven is assured.[1]

When the great Apostle had reminded the Hebrews, that were converted to Christianity, of the succession of great men who up to that time had distinguished themselves by their heroism—Abel, Noah, Abraham, Moses, etc.—at the mere remembrance of those invincible athletes "who by faith conquered kingdoms, wrought justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, recovered strength from weakness, became valiant in battle, put to flight the armies of foreigners, raised the dead: while others were racked, not accepting deliverance, that they might find a better resurrection: and others had trial of mockeries and stripes, moreover also of bonds and prisons; were stoned, were cut asunder, were tempted, were put to death by the sword, wandered about in sheep skins, in goatskins, being in want, distressed, afflicted; of whom the world was not worthy; hiding in deserts, in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth .... seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses," he exclaimed, "let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and run by patience to the combat proposed to us: looking on Jesus the author and finisher of faith, who having joy set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and now sitteth on the right hand of the throne of God."[2]

Such as this, and still more touching and persuasive, is the language, which the Church daily addresses to her children, when leading them through the cycle of her solemnities. Mary and her ineffable prerogatives and her virtues still more admirable; the just Joseph her husband, the nursing father and the preserver of Jesus; John the precursor of the Messiah, and the twelve Apostles, the foundations of His Church. The disciples, who founded particular churches, and the martyrs, who watered the

[1] Matth. xi. 12. [2] Heb. xi. and xii.

tree of faith with their blood; the glorious Pontiffs, who have so nobly borne the title of vicars of Jesus Christ, and the Bishops, so eminent in learning and virtue; the worthy Priests, faithful ministers of the Saviour of mankind; the Fathers of the desert, the glories of the solitary life; the humble virgins and the holy widows; the just men, who, in the cloister or in the world, on the throne or in the camp, in royal courts or in the most obscure employments, have shown by examples so winning, that all are able to fulfil that precept of our divine Master: Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.[1] . . What a number! what a choice! What perfection! The Roman Church has written names enough in her Martyrology to place us every day under a cloud of new witnesses, who in their turn come and say to us, as the mother of the Maccabees to her children: "O my son, look up to heaven, and show thyself worthy of thy brethren, and suffer and die without fear, that thou mayest be reunited with thy brethren!"[2]

If, as St. Augustine has observed,[3] the festivals of the martyrs are the most pressing exhortations to martyrdom, is it not equally true that the festivals of the other saints are the most powerful attraction that can lead us to understand, desire, pursue and attain true sanctity? Yes, our Church militant, when she calls us to contemplate the glory of her sister, who is in triumph, and to present to her our homage and our prayers, leads us to the most touching, the most persuasive, the most perfect school of virtue that has ever existed.

"The world, which is all error and corruption, has its heroes and its festivals. History, poetry, the fine arts celebrate in a thousand ways the triumphs of pride, ambition, cupidity, and luxury. What would become of society, if the apotheosis of all the vices was not opposed by religion in the worship of all the virtues?

"Admiration is a need which must be satisfied; deprive

[1] Matth. v. 48. [2] 2 Macc. vii. 28. [3] Serm. xlvii. *de Sanctis.*

it of its natural food, the spectacle of great virtues, it will attach itself to great crimes. Wherever Protestantism has broken the statues of christian heroes, irreligion and cynicism have raised new ones to their own apostles. The crowns which in former times the youth of Geneva laid at the feet of Christ and His Mother, they now offer to the author of the *Nouvelle Heloise* and the *Confessions!* Visits to the sanctuary of the Queen of virgins have given place to the pilgrimage of Ferney."[1]

V.

Contradictions of Protestants on this point.

The Reformation itself, after having defined, in its catechisms and its confessions of faith, that the invocation of saints was an invention of Antichrist,[2] and an artifice of Satan,[3] that the worship of images was idolatry, that God would not, that His church should be taught by dumb idols,[4] &c., &c.; after having declared a war of extermination, not only against our pictures, our statues, our relics, but also against our convents and our charities,[5] —the Reformation has been led to raise statues to Luther, to represent him on the right hand of Jesus crucified; to celebrate on the second of November, which we consecrate to the memory of the dead, a festival in honor of the Augustinian monk and his wife; to sell by auction bits of his chair, his bed, &c.; to venerate in Lutterworth church the chair of Wickliffe, his pulpit, a piece of his

[1] *Solution de grands problemes*, t. ii. c. 54. [2] *Art. of Smalcald.*

[3] *Helvetic Confession, and those of the French Protestants and of England.*

[4] *Heidelberg Catechism.*

[5] Under the reign of Henry VIII. the Reformation destroyed, in England, 645 monasteries, 90 colleges, 110 hospitals; and under the reign of Edward VI. 2374 colleges, hospitals, or chapels. In France the Huguenots destroyed more than 20,000 churches. On the acknowledgement of one of their party, in a single expedition they burned in Dauphiny alone, 900 towns or villages, and massacred 378 priests or Religious.

cloak,[1] &c. . Protestantism has begun to sound our bells which had fallen into her possession, and even to cast new ones; she has raised on her religious buildings and her funeral monuments, the cross which she had herself thrown down; she has received from Beza the assurance that the portraits of Savonarola, of John Huss, of Zuinglius, of Luther, Œcolampadius, made the same impression on him which those great men formerly produced on their hearers, &c., &c.[2] She ought then to confess that she has gone on the wrong road, and that on this point of doctrine and discipline, as on all others, the truth is to be found in the decrees of our Council.

VI.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION.—(*Continued.*)

On the Invocation, Veneration and Relics of Saints and on sacred Images.

The holy Synod enjoins on all bishops, and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching, that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy Fathers, and to the decrees of sacred Councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently, concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honor (paid) to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, (and) help,[3] for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is alone Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously, who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or, who assert either that they do not pray for men; or, that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular, is idolatry; or, that it is repugnant to the word of God; and is opposed to the honor of the *one mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus;*[4] or, that it is foolish to suppli-

[1] Wiseman's *Lectures on the Invocation of Saints.*

[2] *Portraits des hommes illustres.*

[3] Ad eorum orationes, opem, auxilium confugere.

[4] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

cate, vocally, or mentally,[1] those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ,—which bodies were the living members of Christ, and *the temple of the Holy Ghost*,[2] and which are by Him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified,—are to be venerated by the faithful; through which (bodies) many benefits are bestowed by God on men; so that they, who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or, that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints, are in vain visited with the view of obtaining their aid; are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and now also condemns them.

Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had[3] and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity, or virtue, is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped;[4] or that anything is to be asked of them; or, that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor, which is shown them, is referred to the prototypes, which those images represent; in such wise that by[5] the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints, whose similitudes they bear; as by the decrees of Councils, and especially of the second Synod of Nice, has been defined against the opponents of images.

[1] Voce, vel mente. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 6. [3] Habendas.
[4] Colendæ. [5] Per.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIRST.

ON THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH, ESPECIALLY THOSE WHICH ENJOIN FASTING AND ABSTINENCE.

SESSION TWENTY-FIFTH.

I.

On the legislative power of the Church, and the use she has made of it.

CATHOLIC doctrine has been sufficiently justified both by the proofs we have given of the dogmatic authority of the Church, and by our detailed examination of the definitions of the Council upon the principal points in controversy. Our task, therefore, is finished. We conceive, however, that we ought to add a few very brief considerations on the disciplinary laws as a whole, which every Protestant, who is converted, will thenceforward have to obey.

That the Church has received legislative authority from Jesus Christ cannot be doubted. We are taught so by the words of our Saviour: "Feed my sheep, and my lambs."—"Whatsoever ye shall bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven."—"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."—"Let him who will not hear the Church, be to thee as the heathen and publican, &c."[1] And by those of the Apostle: "Take heed to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God."[2] This is what we are told by the pressing exhortations which the same Apostle gives, to obey all superior authority,[3] and by the formal

[1] Joan. xx. 21; Matth. xvi. 19; Luc. x. 16; Matth. xviii. 17; Joan. xxi. 17.

[2] Act. xx. 28. [3] Rom. xiii. 1; Hebr. xiii. 17.

precepts which he himself imposes;[1] it appears also from laws made by the Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem,[2] and from the unvarying practice of the whole Church. This power of making laws had been bestowed by God on the Synagogue; can we suppose He would have refused it to His Church?

Luther and Calvin in claiming it for themselves have only made it more heavy.[3] The Anglicans have never

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 3. [2] Act. xv.

[3] Luther was asked what should be done with those who, despising the word of God, had not partaken of the supper for twenty years: he answered, "they must be sent to the devil, and after their death buried apart from the faithful." (Table Talk *on the Sacraments*.) As to Calvin, Geneva will not soon forget the system of laws, penalties, espionage, and bloody tyranny, which replaced there the Catholic belief and practice. The *Consistory*, established by the Reformer, composed of twelve laymen and six ministers, was charged with watching over the preservation of sound doctrine and the practice of morality. Its censure was exercised over all persons without exception, and extended to all that was done or said. Each elder was in his quarter the man of the Reformation and the eye of the consistory, bound by oath "to watch over all scandals, to prevent all idolatry, blasphemy, dissoluteness, and whatever else was contrary to the honor of God and the evangelical Reformation." Incorrigible persons, *who set at naught everlasting punishments, and those who professed new doctrines*, were handed over by the consistory to the secular arm. One who passed six months without receiving the supper was banished for a year. The elder was bound every year to go into the house of every family, in company with the minister, and to demand *of all servants, chambermaids, nurses, and strangers an account of their faith, their conduct, and their regular attendance at sermons*. Marriages with persons *coming from popery, who had not made profession of the Gospel*, were null and void. To the consistory was attached a multitude of subordinate informers, whose whole employment consisted in *taking notes of sins committed against God and the state, and in denouncing them to the authorities*. An order of the consistory commands that no one should continue in bed for three days without informing the minister of his district, *in order to obtain consolations or admonitions, which are then more than ever necessary*. In 1546 playing skittles was forbidden; in 1569, backgammon; in 1617 cards and dice, singing songs (not obscene but simply such as were not religious), dancing, disguising one's self in any way, all under pain of a fine and three days' imprisonment. It was forbidden to every person domiciled in the town to eat or drink in any tavern or public house. In 1639, dancing masters were forbidden to teach that

disputed it. The Fathers of Trent repeatedly proclaimed it.

The Church has used this authority with singular moderation, which indicates in her a superhuman wisdom and strength. She has been content with imposing six laws on the great body of her children; and even some of these proceed less from her initiative than from a unanimous wish on the part of the faithful, desiring, on just grounds, to impose a serious obligation on themselves. These laws prescribe presence at mass every Sunday, and keeping holy, certain festivals, receiving the sacrament of Penance at least once a year, Eucharistic communion at Easter, abstinence and fasting on certain days, the support of their Pastors and certain rules about marriage.

The object of all these laws is, as Jesus Christ willed, to "teach men to observe all that He had commanded."[1] Thus the Lord has ordered, that certain days should be set apart for His worship; He also instituted the sacrifice of the Mass as the most holy and most sanctifying act. From these two divine premises the Church concludes that we ought to sanctify the Sunday by being present at Mass. Jesus Christ consecrated certain days by accomplishing on them His greatest mysteries, by His birth, His resurrection, His ascension, &c. . The Church perpetuates this consecration, by the institution of festivals which must be sanctified like Sunday. Our divine Master instituted two sacraments especially necessary for christians, one for recovering lost grace, the other for supporting the spiritual life within us: "Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of man," He said, "and drink His blood, you shall

accomplishment; in 1660, the exhibition of puppet shows was prohibited, and all persons were forbidden to go to see them whether in the town or out of it. *Artisans and others of inferior quality* were forbidden to serve up even at their wedding feasts *turkeys, partridges, game, venison, pastry, &c., &c.* See the *Description of Geneva, ancient and modern*, by Mallet. *Establishment of the Reformation at Geneva*, by Magnin, etc.

[1] Matth. xxviii. 20.

not have life in you;"[1] the Church determines the *time* at which the sick ought to have recourse to this remedy and the faithful who are in health to this food. Lastly, Jesus Christ never ceased to preach penance, and in particular, His example as well as His word, recommends abstinence and fasting; the Church has established for all a kind of *minimum* which reminds us of the obligation of mortifying our senses, and in some measure makes us fulfil it.

These appointments not only determine the meaning of the divine laws, but serve to make them more easy for us to execute. Three obstacles might especially stand in the way of their fulfilment: ignorance in the mind, weakness in the will, and disinclination in the senses. The Church, by her legislation, removes so far as she can these different obstacles.

It is in order to satisfy, for the first time, the precept of the Easter communion, that a child arrived at the age of reason is called to the catechism, and to the school where he learns to read, and during two or three years receives elementary instruction from a catechist or master. The precept of confession soon gives him a director charged with the duty of completing the work of the catechist, and particularly of forming his heart to virtue, telling him in detail, and in the most kindly and winning manner, all that he ought to do or to avoid, in order to prevent or to correct his first wanderings. And the christian ought to receive this lesson of the confessor every time he wishes to sit down at the table of Jesus Christ, and, at the least, once every year. This is not all. Every Sunday each faithful christian is recalled to school, that is, to church; the master of that school is his pastor; and the lesson is especially the sermon in explanation of the Gospel. But the pastor is not the only preacher in the house of God. There every thing is instructive, every thing is edifying; the sight of the altar, the image of the

[1] Joan. vi. 54.

crucified Jesus, those of the Virgin Mary and the saints, the baptistery, the tribunal of penance, the sacred chants, the view of a numerous assembly recollected in prayer or eagerly approaching the Eucharistic table. And, as if all these means were not sufficient, the Church, in instituting festivals makes us pass in review every year all the mysteries of Christianity, and the fairest examples, which the divine model has been pleased to produce in His holy Mother and His greatest Saints.

But of what avail is it that the mind be enlightened, if the will continues weak, powerless, a prey to melancholy and discouragement? Should this proceed from want of being aroused and exhorted, from want of examples, the law for the sanctification of Sundays and Festivals has provided a remedy. But what most frequently disarms our will and makes it despair, is a sin committed, which, so long as it remains unpardoned, seems to call in other sins. It is so difficult to stop ourselves in our fall. At sight of this lamentable ruin the soul is filled with gloom; the law is set aside as impossible, virtue as impracticable. You say: "I have lost the friendship of my God, what more have I to lose? I wished to obey yet was not able to do so, what good is it to continue to wish?" It is impossible to say how fatal this discouragement is, the fruit of a first sin, especially when that state is prolonged; for transgressions soon multiply, habits are formed, the chains are riveted, and you find yourselves soon overwhelmed by a flood of iniquities without being able to escape from it. The Church has foreseen this deadly malady and has provided the effectual remedy: "*Thou shalt confess all thy sins*," she says. By this means she obliges every stray sheep to return to the fold, every one that is ill to be cured, all that are dead to rise again. She breaks the habit which you were beginning to form, she removes the occasion, which was becoming more and more close; she restores to the soul all its freedom, all its joy, and therefore all its energy. And what is more cal-

culated to strengthen that will and to raise it to its highest power than the grace of the sacrament on the one hand, and on the other, the advice, the exhortations, the reproofs, the earnest, impressive words of the confessor!

Is it possible that, notwithstanding all these helps, your soul is still powerless? It is true, indeed, that the spirit is willing and the flesh weak; seductions are so many, occasions so frequent. Well! henceforward no one shall impute his weakness to any thing but his own want of good will, for there shall be afforded to the most feeble-minded, a help more powerful than even the grace of reconciliation, an immense, an infinite help, above all we could have anticipated, above all we could need. "Come then to me, poor weak creature!" says the Church; "and observe well that command which will remove all the difficulty, the other commands could have. Here is my remedy—*thou shalt receive*" . . . It is always easy and pleasant to receive; but *thou shalt receive* . . . more than all the riches, more than all the honors, more than all the enjoyments of earth, more than all created beings, more than heaven itself. . . . *It is thy Creator that thou shalt receive!* . . . Thy *Creator!* nothing less than this! The creative power, the life which produces being out of nothing, the immense, infinite, eternal, almighty! *Thy Creator shalt thou receive* for thy support, thy consolation, thy armor . . . . I am wrong, for thy meat and drink! . . . *Thy Creator shalt thou receive*, that He may dwell in thee and thou in Him, and, as our Council says, that He may cure thy lighter faults and preserve thee from grievous falls.[1] *Thy Creator shalt thou receive, at least at Easter*, in order to begin a new life with the risen Jesus; but it is my desire to see all my children seated at that divine table as often as they surround the holy altar. *Thy Creator shalt thou receive*, as soon as thou arrivest at the age of reason, that He may enlighten thy conscience with a surer, a clearer light than that of reason; in the age of

[1] Session xiii. c. 2.

passion, that He may repress its violence; in thy mature years that He may preside over thy counsels; at the end of life, that He may open to thee the gates of a better life! *Thy Creator shalt thou receive* in thy sufferings, and thou shalt be consoled; in thy temptations, and thy victory shall be easy; every time thou wishest to fulfil a duty or a counsel, and thou shalt find the Lord's yoke softened by an unction so copious that thy burden will lose all its weight, and thou wilt be inebriated with such abundance of delight, that while still an inhabitant of earth, of this abode of toil, privations and struggles, thou wilt often believe that thou art already transported to heaven!

In order, however, that the divine law be always accomplished, there may remain a third obstacle to be overcome, an obstacle which the Reformation has not foreseen, but which has not been overlooked by the Church. It is to remove this obstacle that she imposes on us the second precept about fasting. I speak of the insubordination of the senses.

II.

Of the laws of the Church on Abstinence and Fasting.

We are far from being purely spiritual beings. Alas! we have bodies also, and these bodies do not allow us to forget them; bodies subject to innumerable necessities; bodies which are born in suffering, which grow slowly, decline quickly, and after a few short and evil days fall away into corruption and dust; bodies which several times a day demand their food, and each night their sleep, and day and night a lodging, clothes, and very often remedies for their diseases. To procure what is necessary and desirable for these bodies is called *gaining one's living;* and that is what the great majority of mankind do, till by means of this toil they have gained their death.

In order that this body may be a faithful servant of

the soul, it is necessary that it should be in health. In order that it may be healthy, its appetites, often disorderly, must be subjected to a government, which men agree to call a *regimen*. There is no man living, who is not called on to exercise this empire over his body, and yet, strange to say, the greater number aspire to governing the world and care very little about directing themselves.

The greatest genius in the world, if he does not submit his senses to a suitable regimen, is like a traveller who rides an unbroken horse. If he has taken too much food, his body is laden and heavy; if too little, it feels weak and languishing: if over abundant blood is boiling in his veins, he is light-minded, sensual, voluptuous; if his nerves are contracted and, as it were, set on edge, he is harsh; according as bile or lymph predominate in his temperament, he is choleric and impetuous, or soft and phlegmatic. Too violent exercise overpowers him, difficult digestion gives him a headache, and a headache soon leads to delirium; if he is awkwardly seated at a sermon, he is inattentive; if a fly buzz ever so little in his ears, his mind is distracted; if the slightest injury is done to his brain, his reason at the very instant is *alienated*, a stranger, that is, to humanity, which he no longer understands, and even to the animal nature whose instincts fail him.

But if the excess of heat and of cold, if dryness and humidity, if stagnant air and currents of air, are all alike injurious to him, intemperance in food, in meat and drink, would be more nearly fatal; fatal to his bodily health, for it is written: "Sobriety is health to soul and body;"[1]—"he that is temperate shall prolong life,"[2] &c., &c.; but above all, fatal to the health of his soul, for the Holy Spirit says again, that "wine excites to luxury;"[3] that "to nourish a slave too delicately, is to make him stubborn;"[4] that "the love of wine and pleasure makes even

[1] Eccli. xxxi. 37.
[2] Eccli. xxxvii. 34.
[3] Prov. xx. 1.
[4] Prov. xxix. 21.

wise men apostates;"[1] that "the sensual man perceives not the things, that are of the Spirit of God;"[2] that "flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God."[3]

Those men whom the Apostle calls *slothful bellies*,[4] because their great and only business in this world is the labor of digestion, will never, according to him, be anything but *evil beasts—malæ bestiae, ventres pigri.* Those who have no other God but their belly to serve, will reap from this worship nothing but death, present and eternal.[5] The wicked rich man, of whom it is said that he feasted sumptuously every day, died and was buried in hell. What then was his crime? "*He feasted sumptuously every day.*"[6]

The truth is, there is a perfect incompatibility between several of the virtues enjoined by the christian law and certain physical dispositions produced by luxury and sensuality. His sumptuous daily banquets did not allow the wicked rich man to be chaste, gentle, charitable towards the poor; they must have made prayer insupportable to him, and inspired him with an insurmountable disgust for the Crucified of Calvary. The passion of the Chinese for opium, of the American aborigines for alcohol, of the islanders of Oceanica for idleness, good cheer and polygamy, are the great obstacles in the way of their conversion to Christianity. The army of the Church's enemies is recruited especially among the rich and luxurious, while its most devoted supporters are generally men accustomed to privation and fatigue, as were the Apostles and their first disciples.

The author of the Imitation of Christ, then, is right in saying: "Bridle thy appetite and thou wilt more easily bridle all the inclinations of the flesh;"[7] and this is what all nations have understood when they have made fasting a religious act, a sacrifice acceptable to God and salutary for man.

[1] Eccli. xix. 2. [2] 1 Cor. ii. 14. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 50.
[4] Tit. i. 12. [5] Phil. iii. 19. [6] Luc. xvi. 19.
[7] Lib. i. c. 19.

Therefore, true religion ought to include some precepts of penance and diet; otherwise it would be neglecting to put under a regimen, or in other words to govern, one part of its empire, and that part the most turbulent and factious.

Accordingly, the first precept imposed on man, on man still just and pure, is a precept of abstinence: *De ligno scientiæ boni et mali ne comedas.*[1] It is necessary that man should be warned from the very first, that he is only the tenant of the earth. He can use created things, but not enjoy them as his own. "The land is mine," saith the Lord, "and you are strangers and sojourners with me."[2]

This law, a law so gentle, is violated. The flesh has triumphed over the spirit. Henceforward man will need a stronger restraint against his passions, now become more violent. The laws of abstinence are therefore multiplied. The use of certain kinds of food, called *unclean*, is forbidden to the chosen people.[3] Regular fasts are imposed, which are mentioned by Zacharias.[4] The Levites, during their service in the temple, are bound to abstain from wine and all intoxicating liquors.[5] Those who wish to consecrate themselves to God by a special vow do the same.[6] The Rechabites are commended by God, because, faithful to the promise of their father, they deprive themselves of wine.[7] Whenever the Israelites wish to be delivered from any plague, they join fasting to prayer.[8] Moses, Elias, Daniel, Esther, Judith, practise this means of appeasing the justice of God and securing the help of his mercy.

The Saviour of mankind comes to free our souls from the yoke of Satan; but the freedom which he brings us ought not to emancipate our flesh, which He says is weak,[9] from the control of reason.[10] In order Himself to point out to us the great remedy and to taste it first, He sub-

[1] Genes. ii. 17. [2] Levit. xxv. 23. [3] Levit. xi.
[4] Zach. viii. 19. [5] Levit. x. 9. [6] Num. vi. 2.
[7] Jerem. xxxv. 14. [8] Joel. i. 15. [9] Matth. xxvi. 41.
[10] Gal. v. 13.

mits to a fast of forty days before giving us any other example or any other lesson. He commends the austere life of St. John the Baptist.[1] He teaches us that a certain class of devils cannot be cast out except by prayer and fasting.[2] He traces rules for us to follow when we fast.[3] He explains in what the virtue of bodily mortification consists.[4] It is true that during the course of His short sojourn among His disciples on earth, he would not subject them to fasts more frequent than those, which were required by the law, considering, as He observes with admirable sweetness, that the time of the marriage feast is not a time of mourning;[5] but He declares that when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, then will the children of the bride-chamber fast, that is, they will observe regular fasts, like the disciples of John the Baptist.

And in fact, scarcely has He withdrawn His sensible presence from His children, than they seek a consolation in the holy rigors of penance. Fasts precede ordinations.[6] St. Paul imposes on himself frequent fasts.[7] St. Luke speaks of the fasts, which accompanied certain religious exercises.[8] St. Peter, who declares that up to that time he had never eaten any food forbidden by the law,[9] decides, at the Council of Jerusalem, that henceforth Christians must abstain from blood and from strangled animals.[10] A wisely arranged transition from the legal abstinences to the practices of mortification soon in vigor in the Church.

Tertullian, quoting the opinion of the Catholics opposed to the error of Montanus, says: "The old fasts established by the laws and the prophets being abolished, the only fasts which Christians regarded as *legitimate* (that is, as prescribed by the new law) are those of which the Gospel speaks when it says, that when the bridegroom is taken

[1] Matth. xi. 8.
[2] Matth. xvii. 20.
[3] Matth. vi. 16-18.
[4] Matth. xv. 19.
[5] Matth. ix. 15.
[6] Act. xiii. 2; xiv. 22.
[7] 2 Cor. xi. 27.
[8] Act. xiii. 2.
[9] Act. x. 4.
[10] Act. xv. 20.

away his people will fast."[1] "We fast in Lent each year, in accordance with the tradition of the Apostles, the whole world agreeing with us," says St. Jerome.[2] St. Athanasius, in an encyclical letter to the Catholic bishops, says: "These things were done near the feast of Easter, in the very season of holy Lent, when the brethren were fasting." "The entire world unites in celebrating with laudable devotion the forty days before Easter, which are most sacred throughout the whole earth," says St. Augustine."[3] The first Council of Nice mentions this Quadragesimal fast, (can. 5,) and the Council of Laodicea (can. 50) enjoins it as of strict necessity. After that period the heresiarch Aerius, who wished to leave abstinence and fasting free to the choice of each individual, *considering that we are not under the law*, was condemned by the whole Church. With this exception almost all the heretics of the early ages, the Nestorians, Eutychians, Armenians, Copts, have religiously preserved the fast of Lent.

Those fasts which are observed on the eve or vigil of certain festivals can be traced back, like those of holy Lent, to the highest antiquity. The Greek Menologies, the Latin Martyrologies, the homilies of the Fathers, made on the days of the vigils, inform us that the night preceding solemn festivals was spent in watchings, prayers, hymns and spiritual readings, accompanied by fasting.[4]

The three days of fasting called *Ember Days*, or *the fasts of the four seasons*, because they occur at each season calling down the blessings of heaven on them and on the ordinations which are made at those times, are no less recommended by their antiquity. From the Apostolic age fasting was regarded as a preparation for the imposition of hands.[5] St. Luke speaks of one of these periods

[1] Lib. *De jejuniis.* c. 2. [2] Epist. liv. *ad Marcellam.*

[3] Serm. cciv and ccv (*al. de div.* lxxiii and lxxiv), in Quadrag, v and vi.

[4] St. Leo repeatedly mentions the vigil of St. Peter. St. Bernard has sermons for the vigils of Christmas, of St. Andrew, etc.

[5] Act. xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 22.

consecrated by fasting.[1] St. Athanasius mentions that which follows Pentecost, and the whole four are enumerated by St. Leo.[2]

The days of abstinence, such as we observe every week, were in primitive times fasts, of which Tertullian and St. Epiphanius, speak.[3] St. Jerome, when asked if we ought to fast on Saturday, replied that in his opinion; "Ecclesiastical traditions ought to be observed (particularly those which do not affect the faith) as they have been delivered to us by our ancestors, in our own country, and ought not to be altered because another custom is observed elsewhere." And he adds: "Would that we could fast always."[4]

St. Monica had been accustomed to fast on Saturday. When she came to Milan she found, that it was not the practice to fast on that day, and hesitated as to what she should do. St. Ambrose reassured her by these words which St. Augustine praised as an oracle of heaven; "When I am at Rome, I fast on Saturday: when I am here I do not. So you also, whatever church you come to, follow its practice, if you would not be a scandal to any or be scandalized by them."[5]

For many centuries the fast, which in primitive times was observed on Wednesdays and Fridays, has been replaced by abstinence on Fridays and Saturdays. Friday is the day of our Saviour's Passion and death, Saturday is that of His burial and also the vigil of the great day consecrated by His resurrection. Abstinence, which is a partial fast, reminds us of the sentiments that ought to animate us on these days of mourning, and serves as a preparation for the solemnity of Sunday.

Thus these practices, which the lively and generous

[1] Act. xxvii. 9.

[2] St. Athan, *Apol. pro fuga sua;* n. 6; St. Leon. Serm. vii. *de jejunio decimi mensis,* c. 2.

[3] Tert. *jejuniis,* c. 2; St. Epiphan, *adv. Hæres.* lxxv.

[4] Epist. xxviii, *ad Lucinium.*

[5] Epist. liv. al. cxviii. *ad Januarium,* c. ii.

faith of our forefathers imposed on them, and which have been sanctioned by the authority of the Church, serve to sanctify the use of the creatures to us by a light and reasonable acknowledgement. They assist us to make satisfaction for the numerous faults which we commit against strict temperance. They render us more and more conformed to our great pattern, Jesus Christ. They draw down His grace upon us, as the Holy Ghost teaches.[1] This change of regimen which recurs each week, this light diet in spring time, are not less conducive to the health of the body than to that of the soul. The Church tells us this as well as the medical faculty.[2] "In spring," says the *Bibliotheque choisie de medecine*,[3] "we ought to reduce the quantity and quality of our ordinary food. The juices of meat are then the most undesirable, those of fish and vegetables are best; and if Lent was not a religious institution, it ought to be prescribed by medical science." "It is to bring man back to a primitive and simple kind of life, and to the gentleness of patriarchal manners, that wise men instituted general fasts," says the *Dictionnaire des sciences medicales*.[4] When prudent and well regulated fasting ought to moderate the vital movements . . . It was the cause of the extreme longevity of the anchorites . . . it softens the moral qualities, brings back the mind to feelings of humanity and modesty, and contributes to civilization and purity of morals. "The frequent use of meat," says Broussais, "is in the end one of the great causes of ill health." "The continuance of the same regimen," says Rostan, "predisposes us to certain indispositions."[5] "To the sacraments and prayer" says Dr. Descuret, "religion joins fasting and abstinence, physical means calculated to diminish the violence of our passions, and in her profound wisdom she prescribes that they be longer and more severe precisely at that season of the year, when all nature is about to enter into fermentation. If the rig-

[1] Tob. xii. 8. [2] *Oratio in sabbat, post Cineres.*
[3] Tom. i. p. 55. [4] Art. Jeune. [5] *Cours elem d'hygiene.*

or of the season, poverty, a constitution weakened by age, ill health or toil, hinders any from following the precept strictly, she easily dispenses with it: but wishes that such should make up for it by alms proportioned to their fortune.[1] Thus it is that in combating two vices, both unhappily too common, intemperance and avarice, she weakens the impetuosity of anger and the excitement of passion, at the same time that she pours the superfluity of the rich into the hands of the poor." And after having observed that intemperance is the cause of half the maladies which desolate the human race, he concludes that, "the laws of the Church, on abstinence and fasting have been instituted with the threefold end of rural economy, health and expiation, and that they also evidence the knowledge and prudence of those who made them, as much as the ignorance or thoughtlessness of those professedly strong minds that find fault with them."[2]

III.

Reply to certain objections.

Such men usually attack our pious observances by sarcasms, rather than by reasons. Here, however, are some texts which they allege against us. "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man."[3] By these words Jesus Christ condemned the error of the Sadducees, renewed at a later period by the Manichees, who attributed an impure origin to flesh, supposed it to be created by an evil genius, and consequently forbade the use of it for food. The Church has always condemned these dreams. According to her testimony it is not meat stolen, or eaten to excess, or at forbidden times, which directly defiles the

[1] Descuret is not correct here. The usage which he justifies is merely local. It is not alms, but prayers at the foot of the altar which the head of the Church imposes on those whom he dispenses from abstinence.

[2] *Médicine des passions*, pp. 218, 350, and 356. [3] Matth. xv. 2.

heart, but the robbery, intemperance or disobedience to the Church.

But did not the Son of God say to His Apostles: "Eat such things as are set before you?"[1] The Son of God said these words to His disciples, when he sent them two and two into Judea, forbidding them to set their foot on the land of the heathen, but He did not even intend to give them a dispensation from the laws of abstinence, which were faithfully observed by the Jews at that period. Assuredly every one of the disciples on returning from his mission might have said, as St. Peter did, "*I have never eaten anything common or unclean.*"[2] The meaning of our Saviour's recommendation, a meaning supplied by the whole context, is this: Avoid all research and nicety, all singularity as to your food. Thus, do not take provisions with you: enter the first house that offers, and leave it not to seek a better lodging: salute no one by the way, do not waste your time in useless talking, etc., etc.

Lastly, does not the Apostle say: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat!"[3] The Apostle is here resolving a case of conscience, which greatly embarressed the faithful at Corinth, who were living in the midst of heathens. It was a recognized principle that they, who ate of the victim, were partakers in the sacrifice.[4] Now the Christians every day found in the market meat which was exposed for sale after having been offered on the altars of the false Gods. What should they do under such circumstances? Ask no question of the seller as to the use, to which the flesh now exposed for sale may have been previously put, is the answer of St. Paul, but eat it with thanksgiving; if however the person who sells it, informing you of the use to which such meat had been devoted, is scandalized at seeing you use it, then abstain from it. For, he says, with a generosity which the despoilers of the Church are not tempted to imitate: "If what I eat

[1] Luc. x. 8. [2] Act. x. 14. [3] 1 Cor. x. 25. [4] 1 Cor. x. 18.

scandalizes my brother, I will never eat flesh, lest I scandalize my brother."[1] All this, as you see, is very different from the Ecclesiastical precept of abstinence and fasting.

This is what the Council says on the subject.

IV.

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION.—(*Continued.*)

HELD DECEMBER 5, 1563.

The holy Synod furthermore exhorts, and by the most holy advent of our Lord and Saviour, conjures all pastors, that, like good soldiers, they sedulously recommend to all the faithful all those things which the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, has ordained, as also those things which, as well in this Council as in the other œcumenical Councils, have been ordained, and to use all diligence that they be observant of all thereof, and especially of those which tend to mortify the flesh, such as the choice of meats, and fasts; as also those which serve to promote piety, such as the devout and religious celebration of festival days; often admonishing the people to obey those set over them, (Heb. xiii. 17,) whom they who hear, shall hear God as a rewarder, whereas they who contemn them, shall feel God himself as an avenger.

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 13.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SECOND.

CONCLUSION.

I.

The Reformation, convicted by its own contradictions of having calumniated the Church, undergoes the punishment it wished to inflict on her.

SUSANNA, pure and faithful even to heroism, had preferred death, the most cruel and disgraceful death, to the dishonor proposed to her by unworthy magistrates. These hypocritical judges did not shrink from accusing her of a crime, which had no existence except in the imaginations of their own hearts. Repulsed in their attempt to commit adultery, they had succeeded in their atrocious calumny; and Susanna, condemned to death, was on the way to be stoned.

Meanwhile she uttered aloud the prayer: "O eternal God, who knoweth the things that are hidden from man, Thou knowest that they have borne false witness against me, and behold I must die, whereas I have done none of the things whereof they accuse me!"

The Lord heard her weeping; and while they were leading her to the place of execution, a young man, named Daniel, filled with the Holy Spirit, cried out: "I am clear from the blood of this woman. Are ye so foolish, ye children of Israel, that without examination or knowledge of the truth, ye have condemned a daughter of Israel? Return to judgment, for they have borne false witness against her."

They obeyed him: He separated the two elders from each other, and addressing himself to the first, who was

brought before him, said: "O thou that art grown old in evil days, now are thy sins come out. Tell me under what tree the crime was committed?" He answered, "Under a mastic tree." "Well," said Daniel, "the Angel of God having received sentence of Him, shall cut thee in two."

Then addressing himself to the other, he said: "O thou seed of Chanaan, and not of Juda, lust hath perverted thy heart: thus did you do to the daughters of Israel, but a daughter of Juda would not abide your wickedness. Now therefore tell me, under what tree didst thou take them: And he answered, "Under a holm tree." "Well," said Daniel; "the angel of the Lord is waiting with a sword to cut thee in two, and to destroy you."

On this all the assembly crying out with a loud voice, demanded the death of the two wicked judges, and immediately inflicted it upon them; and Susanna restored to honor, became more pure and more fair in the eyes of her husband; and Daniel, from that day forward, was great in the eyes of all the people.[1]

Now the wife of Joachim, in her fidelity as well as in the cruel trial in which she obtained so glorious a triumph, is an image of the Church.

The Church is rightly called the Bride of Jesus Christ. The beloved Spouse whom He purchased at the cost of His own life, and whom He has regenerated by His blood, nourished with His flesh, animated with His Spirit, enriched with all His treasures, and, destined to share His inheritance; whom He has labored to make at all times pure and beautiful, ever free from blemishes and wrinkles;[2] a Spouse constantly faithful, with whom He has promised to dwell all days even to the consummation of the world. The powers of hell in vain assail her, they will never prevail against her.[3]

Notwithstanding this, men dare to assail her with the most odious calumnies. Jealous of her beauty, despairing

[1] Dan. xiii. [2] Ephes. v. 27. [3] Matth. xvi. 18.

of being able to corrupt her inviolable integrity by an impure mixture, they accuse this chaste Spouse of Christ of having betrayed her fidelity; and not only do they accuse her, they condemn her; they devote her to destruction, and call on the multitudes misled by their false testimony to stone her. And this cruel game has been incessantly played over and over again for the last three centuries! Is it not high time that it come to an end? that a return to reflection should make this infernal misunderstanding cease? I adjure you, then, in the name of heaven, you who even now are holding a stone in your hands to cast on the Church your mother, "Return to judgment," and understand that it is a fatal error which arms you against innocence, "for they have borne false witness against her."[1]

I take her accusers separately, and I ask them in presence of the whole Christian world: after all, what is the crime of the Catholic Church?

She has varied in her doctrine, say her ancient enemies. She refuses to vary, and to advance with the age, say the moderns.

She has conceded too much to reason, especially in borrowing the doctrine of free-will from Philosophy, says Calvin. She has too much disregarded the rights of reason, say our Socinians, by restraining freedom of thought.

Her crime is that she has added to the divine command, say these. It is, say those, that she has taken from them.

She has clung too closely to tradition, is said on the right hand. She has departed too much from it, is said on the left.

The one party accuse her of having made a compact with error. The other of having shown herself intolerant to an excess.

She has withdrawn the cup from the laity, say these,

[1] Revertimini ad judicium, quia falsum testimonium locuti sunt adversus eam. *Dan.* xiii. 49.

who themselves do not believe in the Real Presence. She had invented purgatory, say many who believe only in a temporary hell, which is really a purgatory. She has deprived the children of God of the freedom which Christ has give them, say the very persons who deny human liberty. She does an injury to the merits of Jesus Christ, in insisting on the need of our own merits as a condition of salvation, say the majority of those unhappy Christians, who do not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ! She has enervated discipline by the abuse of indulgences, say the latest advocates of justification by faith only, a monster indulgence which makes all good works useless.

She has invented several Sacraments, is said in most of the groups around us. But tell us then how . . . . .? and and in what place? and at what time? to this question there are as many answers as there are answerers: three, four, five, seven; under Gelasius, under Innocent, under Gregory; at Rome, at Constantinople, at the Council of Lateran, &c., &c.

You say that Antichrist is throned in the See of Rome. But in the person of what Pope? Of Gregory the Great, is the reply of the Centuriators of Magdeburg, for he was a detestable man. Gregory was not ambitious, is the answer of Luther, but a worthy and holy Bishop. And each of the names I allege excites the same imprecations on the one side, the same blessings on the other.

But suppose then you try to state your grievances with more precision. You accuse the Catholic Church of having usurped that authority which she exercises over the understandings of men and which is so well justified by the characteristics of unity, sanctity, &c., which shine forth in her. But what do you offer instead? Contradictions, variations, divisions, instead of unity; anarchy, instead of authority; the instincts of corrupt nature, instead of sanctity; local, transient, incoherent opinions, regulated by the state or inspired by the fanaticism of separatists, instead of catholicity and apostolicity; the disorder of

chaos and the image of hell instead of the work and the image of heaven.

You say that the Catholic Church has varied. But if you make this a reproach against her, how do you defend yourselves for having your own variations? How is it that you venture to lay down as a principle that the creed of the Church is essentially variable?[1] and in what sect will you be able to show us the true Church of Jesus Christ, aided by the presence of His divine Spirit, which ought never to have changed? And if on the contrary you praise the Church for its variations, as so many steps of progress, then can you no longer see in her but a human work, perfectible like other works of man; then in her head you see nothing but a human being like yourselves, and if you see in Jesus Christ only a man, you are no longer Christians.

You are incessantly invoking the testimony of the Scriptures against the Church, you who cannot have faith in the Scriptures, except on the proposition of the Church? You who do not cease to shake the authority of the Scriptures by your rash criticism, and your unfaithful translations? You who give them so many different interpretations, which oppose and destroy one another! . . . you who at the present day are denying their inspiration and, consequently, their divine authority? . . . . and yet all the time, if soundly interpreted, the Scriptures, as we have proved, testify in our favor, and against you.

You reject the tradition handed down, from the time of the Apostles, by the Sovereign Pontiff, the Councils, the Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church, and to prove that you are not of yesterday, you are reduced to invoke another tradition, but alas, what tradition! No longer that of Simon Peter, but that of Simon Magus, who denied free will and good works; of the Gnostics, who rejected the severities of penance; of Cerdon and Marcion, who tampered with the Canon of Holy Scrip-

[1] Synod of Lausanne in 1838.

ture; of Florinus, who held that God was the author of sin; of the Montanists, who overthew the tribunal of penance; of the Novatians, the enemies of Confirmation; of the Manichees, the partisans of a predestination of evil, and of fatalism; of the Arians, who refused to admit the consubstantiality of the Word, because that term is not to be found in Scripture; of Aerius, the despiser of episcopacy and of the law of fasting; of Jovinian, who assailed the Virginity of Mary and the celebacy of priests; of the Pelagians, who no longer considered baptism necessary; of Photius, the opponent of the Pope's Supremacy; of Berengarius, who four times retracted his errors as to the real presence; of the Waldenses, the Albigenses; the Beghards, the Lollards, who set at nought the sacraments, the indulgences and authority of the church; of Marsilius of Padua, Wiclef, John Huss, who preceded the Reformation by raising from the grave the great part of the ancient heresies . . . Such is the genealogy, which you make for yourselves! . . . Such are the men in antiquity, in whom the history of your religious revolutions glories! In the bosom of such a family, how well are you placed for mocking at and treading under foot the traditional teaching of the Iræneus', the Athanasius', the Ambroses, the Augustines, the Leos, the Gregories, &c., of the fathers of Nice, Chalcedon, Ephesus, &c.

In order to escape from this weight of authority you profess not to admit any doctrine, which is not distinctly expressed in Scripture. But where do you find it written that the Scriptures exist, and that such and such a book has received the seal of divine Inspiration? and what text tells you that infants are saved by the faith of their parents, without baptism; that faith alone justifies; that God wills sin and obliges us to sin; that His commandments are impossible; that He has created a few men for heaven, all the rest for hell; that priests and religions can break the engagements they have made; that marriage is absolutely preferable to virginity; that the angels and

saints do not know of our prayers, &c., and in fine, that God has revealed nothing, and man has nothing to believe except what is written in Scripture.

You reject tradition as subversive of the Christian faith. And yet the little christianity you have preserved, you hold from tradition, by which alone you have learned the relics of religious opinions and practices, which you still possess. For all these opinions you draw from the Bible; and that is conveyed to you by tradition; and all these practices you sum up in the observance of Sunday, and it is tradition alone which authorizes you to substitute that day for the Sabbath of the Jews.

Your most bitter reproaches against the Catholic Church and her Pontiffs were expressed in these few words: "You are organs of Antichrist;" which was equivalent to saying: "You destroy the work, you reject the authority, you deny the divinity of Jesus Christ." Now, while you were going on from age to age repeating this atrocious calumny, an invention of Luther, what came to pass? . . . Why that you, in order to avoid increasing your divisions, condemned yourselves not to give an explicit answer to this question: Is Jesus Christ God? . . . That, notwithstanding this precaution, the greater part of your theologians have declared themselves for the negative . . . . that one can no longer recognize the work of the Son of God among you in this mutilated, disfigured christianity, which is every day new, every day more divided and more uncertain, and which is preached in so many different forms. . . . . It follows that you are beginning to recognize the work of Antichrist in the pretended Reformation, which has hatched deism, unbelief, pantheism[1] . . . . while it is notorious that the Catholic Church has never ceased to proclaim the authority and the divinity of Jesus Christ, opposing to all heresies the ancient confession of

[1] Omnis qu non confitetur Filium Dei ut Deum venisse in carne et esse Deum perfectum, et factum esse hominem perfectum, antichristus est. St. Joan. Damas. de Fid. orthod. lib. iv.

faith of her first Pontiff. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!"[1]

You allege as an objection to the Church (which however condemns them) the existence of a few licentious monks . . . . . and you panegyrize Luther! The ambition of some priests annoys you, and you believe in Calvin! You detest tyranny, and you have for Apostles Gustavus Vasa and Henry VIII.! You protest against arbitrariness and you will have the question of baptismal regeneration defined by Victoria!

The Church, you say, has unworthy ministers within her pale. She acknowledges it, she mourns over it; and these are precisely the persons whom you eagerly follow into that frightful abyss opened by an Augustinian monk, by a canon of Noyon, a curé of Zurich, a grand master of the Teutonic Order, by a few bishops; cowardly courtiers of Henry VIII., Gustavus Vasa, Sigismond II. . . . So that it is impossible for you to deny that between you and the Catholics, there is the difference which separates the dupes and victims of bad priests, from the faithful who are steadily attached to their good and legitimate pastors.

You are scandalized by the defects and vices which may be found amongst us, and, *in consequence*, you would deprive us of what would preserve or cure us: the worship of the saints, the confession of sins, the Real Presence, the practice of fasting and abstinence, our belief in the authority of the Church, in the necessity of good works, in purgatory! And when a general Council applies itself to effecting our *reformation*, you make all haste to protest against it!

You opened the war against us by your protest against indulgences, which, you said, enervated discipline, and slackened all ardor for good works? and very soon you yourselves broke up all discipline and denied the necessity and the merit of good works!

You make the love of gain a crime in some of our

[1] Matth. xvi. 16.

priests?—and you condemn at the same time their life of celibacy, the most economical for the people of all the institutions of the Church, and that which most evidently proves disinteredness of views in her ministers; and the Anglican establishment is the richest in the world.

You exalt marriage above ecclesiastical and religious celibacy; but in what view? Is it that in your eyes Christian marriage is holy and and sanctifying?—No, for you have deprived it of its character as a sacrament! Is it from a sincere love for the family relations?—No, for yourselves break those sacred ties by divorce! Can it be then that you have not grace enough to attain to this sublime perfection? In that case then do not any longer aspire to the glory of being the Holy Church of Jesus Christ!

You reproach some of our Ecclesiastics with encroaching on the temporal power, you demand loudly the separation of the two powers; you raise all Europe against a "Pontiff-King" and everywhere you yourselves concentrate and confound those two powers in the hand of your governors—be they men or women, believers or unbelievers!

Partisans of Equality, you have established among men the most monstrous inequality ever dreamed of, by your cruel distinction between the elect, who alone are justified, who alone cannot lose justice, who alone are superior to all law, whose sins (and theirs only) are all venial, and the non-predestined, who are always sinners, whatever they do, guilty of deadly sin in every transgression, and necessarily, inevitably, devoted to Hell!

You proclaim yourselves defenders of the dignity of man! and you have invented those degrading systems, which make the son of Adam, as soon as he is conceived in his mother's womb a substance essentially evil; of the justified man, a whited sepulchre; of free will, a word without meaning; and of the human will, an instrument

simply passive under the hand of God, a block, a stone, a saw.

You boast of your patriotism? and your leader wrote and preached that to make war on the Turks was to resist God! And you have broken the unity of the great Christian family! and have lighted up everywhere the torch of civil war! and you have been the cause of the origin of these antisocial doctrines, the consequences of which alarm you, as endangering property, the family, public order, and which, if they were to triumph, would substitute barbarism for christianity throughout the world.

You reproach Catholics with intolerance, who ever since the age of Constantine and of Charlemagne have formed a polity essentially submitted to the religious law, and who besides have always professed the dogma: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus!* And you, you who have inscribed on your banner: "Liberty of examination;" you who believe that salvation is possible within the pale of our church, you have contended against us, the peaceable possessors of an immemorial right, with an intolerance as inconsistent as it is cruel! You have persecuted every one who refused to believe in your supremacy! You have burnt Servetus, beheaded Gruet, Gentilis, etc. . . . ! You preached the crusade against the Anabaptists! You have composed treatises, you Luther and you Calvin, to prove that the sword ought to be used to execute justice on heretics: you have destroyed our churches, pillaged our monasteries, murdered our priests, placed millions of Catholics in the alternative between apostacy and death. And you still reproach us with the Inquisition of which we scarely know the name; the massacre of St. Bartholomew, a detestable plot laid for a revolutionary party by a policy reduced to extremities, and which was Protestant rather than Catholic; and with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; while you forget the persecution of Catholics in England and Ireland, continued during two

centuries, with every refinement of cruelty exercised on the priests, and the ingenious and diabolical contrivances of the "penal laws."

Are there not contradictions enough on your side? and we have brought forward but a very small part of them; and is it not clearer than the sun at noonday that the accusations, which you still repeat on the authority of the reformers, were, from the very first, false and calumnious?

And must you not admit that the authors of the schism were themselves the great culprits, when we in our turn, taking the offensive, accuse them:

Of having dared, carried away by the violence of passion, to lay an adulterous and sacrilegious hand on the spouse of Christ;

Of having added to this outrage, which her fidelity repelled, defamation and calumny;

Of having abused their sacred character and their holy profession in the interest of their imposture; and of having thus prepared, in many countries, which had previously been christian, the ruin of Christianity, and caused the loss of faith and salvation to innumerable generations.

The sentence is given, and, behold, the Angel of the Lord comes to execute it. He is arming himself with the sword by which those infamous elders are to undergo the punishment they would have inflicted on her. Heresy, convicted of having broken the unity of the Church, is itself broken up into numberless sects, each of which is soon subdivided into numberless others.[1] A rebel against authority, she has no longer even the shadow of authority. She destroyed our altars, she has no longer any solemn worship. She has renounced our Saints, she has no longer anything but philosophers, for the most part sceptics; she has heaped abuse on our celibacy, she is con-

[1] Angelus Dei, accepta sententia a Deo, scindet te medium. *Dan.* xiii. 55.

demned to divorce; she has called the Vicar of Jesus Christ, Antichrist, she is reduced to play the part, and she must expect the fate, of Antichrist. She has no consistency, no repose, no security, no power except to pull down; all the gold of which she has robbed our sanctuaries cannot buy her one of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The princes of the world domineer over her, the people despise her, the Scriptures mislead her, unbelief is invading her, all that gave her the deceitful semblance of a Church is slipping from her; Pantheism acknowledges her as a mother, the Synagogue as an accomplice and an ally; earnest minds are forsaking her; her teachers no longer conceal from her, that they are without mission; and as to the Heresiarch himself, if he died without detesting his impiety, we know how terrible a chastisement divine justice makes him undergo. St. John has shown us "the false prophets, with the devil, who seduced them, and the beast whom he made men adore, cast into the pool of fire and brimstone, where they shall be tormented night and day for ever and ever."[1]

And meanwhile the faithful Bride of Christ, the Church, completely justified and restored to honor, rises from this trial still more beautiful and more pure. She has been raised in the esteem of the nations, who bless the Lord for the love which He still has for her, and the protection with which He surrounds her; and they who have pleaded her cause will henceforward be great in the eyes of God and of men.[2]

[2] Diabolus qui seducebat eos, missus est in stagnum ignis et sulphuris, ubi et bestia et pseudopropheta cruciabuntur die ac nocte, in sæcula sæculorum. *Apoc.* xx. 9, 10.

[3] Laudaverunt Deum pro Susanna, quia non esset inventa in ea res turpis. Daniel autem factus est magnus in conspectu populi, a die illa et deinceps. *Dan.* xiii. 63, 64.

II.

Necessity of professing the known truth, by returning to the external communion of the Catholic Church.

As much as Daniel was exalted by the courageous support he gave to the daughter of Helcias, so much and still more would he have been dishonored in his own eyes and in the eyes of the whole world, had he left her to perish, when he was convinced of her innocence.

If to be justified we must "believe with the heart," we must, according to the Apostle, "confess with the mouth," in order to be saved;[1] and Jesus Christ will not acknowledge in presence of His Father and the Angels of heaven any but those, who have confessed Him before men.[2]

To keep the truth captive is a crime in the first place against the truth itself, which should be free and ever reign supreme, just as light demands that it be not hidden under a bushel.[3] It is a crime also against humanity, to which we owe a part of that treasure which is our common patrimony. "Let men see your good works," Jesus Christ has said, "that they may glorify your Father who is in heaven."[4] Lastly, it would be a crime against ourselves, for if nothing is so honorable as straightforwardness and honesty in making our belief and our conduct harmonize, so nothing can be more odious than that practical Manicheeism, which would endeavor to bring the principle of good and the principle of evil within us into agreement. Our Saviour has said: "No man can serve two masters: either make the tree good and its fruit good; or make the tree evil and its fruit evil. For by the fruit the tree is known."[5]

When therefore the truth comes down from its home in heaven to dwell on earth, every man of good-will should go to meet it, like the shepherds and the magi hastening to the crib of Jesus. Every pure heart ought

[1] Rom. x. 10. [2] Matth. x. 32. [3] Matth. v. 15.
[4] Matth. v. 16. [5] Matth. vi. 24; xii. 33.

to embrace it, as Mary received the Word made flesh, with the most submissive docility: *Ecce ancilla Domini, fiat!* Every generous soul, after the example of the Apostles and disciples, ought to leave all and follow it: *Relictis retibus et patre, secuti sunt eum.* A distinct voice, the voice of the heavenly Father, sounds in our heart of hearts, and says: "Here is He in whom I am well pleased, my Word ever-faithful, my beloved Son, the witness of the Truth, and the Truth itself, hear his words." And on presenting Himself, the Word says to us, as He said of old to the Jews: "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh to the Father but by Me." To refuse to give up the direction of our heart and of our conduct to the truth, would be to renew the crime of the Jews, thus described by St. John; "The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it . . . He came unto His own, and His own received Him not."[1] To reject the truth in order not to have to descend from a heretical pulpit, and to continue a minister of error and of schism, is, like Caiphas, to reject Christ at the very same time that you acknowledge the reality of His miracles; and to prefer a vile gain to the sacred interests of the true religion, is, like Judas, to sell your Saviour for the value of a few pieces of silver. The indifferent man, who only looks on divine revelation as a matter of curiosity, merely to amuse himself with it and to say, *I have seen it*, reminds us of Herod, who received Jesus into his court only to turn Him into ridicule. He who, fearing to displease the princes of this world and the dispensers of wealth, condemns the truth to die in his heart—would he not be another Pilate, giving up Christ to be crucified as soon as he hears those shouts of the multitude: "If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend!"[2] Now the profession of the truth brings us back to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Jesus Christ willed that His Church, His one bride,

[1] Joan. i. 5. [2] Joan. xix. 12.

should be visible; visible in the sacramental rite, which she employs for the initiation of the faithful, Baptism; visible in her members, baptized persons, externally submitted to legitimate pastors; visible in her head, the Roman Pontiff, governing the bishops and the people over whom he has placed them; visible in her places of meeting, her temples, her cathedrals, parish churches, &c.; visible in her government, in her worship, in her laws, in her judgments, in the punishments she inflicts on her rebellious children, such as excommunication, interdict and other censures; lastly, visible in the active influence which she exercises over christendom and over the whole world. By all these means, and by her distinctive characteristics of unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity, the true Church of Jesus Christ is as visible as a light set upon a candlestick in the middle of a room, or as a city placed on the top of a hill in view of all the country round. It follows that, in order to belong to this church, it is necessary to separate from the sects to which by birth or by choice we have hitherto belonged, to make an act of submission to the true pastors, to ask and to receive from them, together with absolution from our sin, admission to the Catholic communion. To pretend to content ourselves with believing inwardly with the church, while not united outwardly to its members or its pastors, would be to wish to belong to an invisible church, which possesses neither the remission of sins nor the Eucharist, neither pastors nor territory; which has nothing to distinguish it from the condemned sects, and which could not be recognized by men or by Jesus Christ: or rather it would be a refusal to belong to any church whatever, for "church" means "assembly," and these invisible christians, in what place of the world, by what power, under what name and for what purpose would they be assembled?

A church composed of the elect alone, to which one ceases to belong, not as soon as one is excommunicated, but as soon as one is a sinner, is nothing but a Jansenisti-

cal invention, a vain imagination of Quesnel,[1] in order to shelter himself from the thunderbolts of Rome. It is not this unknown thing, which is the spouse of the Son of God, and which the christians of the two worlds call their mother.

It is therefore to the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church, represented in the parish by the Priest, sent and established by the Bishop; in the diocese by the Bishop, instituted by the Pope and continuing in communion with him; in the world by the Sovereign Pontiff, instituted by Jesus Christ in the person of Peter, that each one must give his adhesion and his faith forever.

Undoubtedly this act of submission may cost us much; but it is a question of our resuming our rank in the church militant. The true faith is that treasure hid in a field which we must lose no time in acquiring at the cost of all that we possess.[2] Jesus Christ has forewarned us of it: "If you love any person or anything more than Me, you are not worthy of Me. Unless you renounce all that you possess, you cannot be my disciple. Enter ye in at the narrow gate," and follow the little frequented road that leads to life . . . "Blessed are they, who suffer persecution for justice sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven . . . The kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and the violent (they who do violence to themselves) bear it away . . . I come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother . . . And a man's enemies shall be they of his own household &c., &c."[3]

Many fear that by leaving a schismatical body they are condemning their ancestors; but let them go back in thought to those of their forefathers, who during so many ages lived and died Catholics, and they will under-

[1] See the propositions of Quesnel, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, condemned by Clement XI.

[2] Matth. xiii. 44.

[3] Matth. x. 37; Luc. xiv. 33; Matth. vii. 13, 14; v. 10; xi. 12; x. 35, 36.

stand that their own return to the Church, so far from disgracing, will restore to credit the memory of their fathers. An ambassador of the King of France was dying in England: a friend asked him if he did not feel some regret at having to be buried among heretics. "I will give orders," he replied, "that they dig my grave very deep, and then I shall find myself in holy ground again, and on a level with and in the midst of my own people." "One should die in the religion of one's fathers," said a Protestant prince to the Count of Stolberg. "Pardon me, prince," replied the Count, "it is better still to die in that of one's grandfathers."

Some persons allege the pledge they took at the time of their first communion. But to what did they intend to bind themselves by that pledge? To continue in error? In that case the oath is null and void; the God of truth never could have ratified it; it is an object of horror in His eyes. Or to examine all and to yield faith only to the true doctrine of Jesus Christ? And in that case their oath itself obliges them to become Catholics.

Others have manifold and violent opposition to encounter; but even supposing that this opposition was inspired by a love of truth, blind though sincere, yet it tells us in eloquent language how much we ought ourselves to love the truth, and how much ardor, resolution and firmness we ought in our turn to display in order to win it.

"We shall cause much sorrow to our friends;" but if we love them like christians, what greater service can we do them than to instruct them, to edify them, to encourage them by the example of our conversion? Besides, let us hope that this sorrow will soon be turned into joy.

"We shall have to make up our minds to see our intentions misunderstood and misrepresented." But justice will be done us by God at once, and by men in time. And how many who blame it aloud, will in secret applaud our conduct! And how many, who disapprove our act now will one day imitate it! "An honest man never changes

his religion," they say; but in its universal application this proposition is false, for it would condemn those who, in obedience to the voice of conscience, exchange evil for good and error for truth; it would pronounce an anathema on the conversion of the heathen to Christianity, and would suppose that all religions are equally good and revealed by God. We must therefore understand this popular dictum in the sense, that an honest man never determines carelessly, or from interest, caprice or fear, in so grave a matter as the choice of a creed or religion. Besides, it is evident that an honest man, that is to say, a man of probity, a sincere and conscientious man, cannot act upon a doctrine, which he holds to be erroneous, or continue in a religion which he knows to be false; especially if, as a father of a family, he is followed to the preaching, to the synagogue, or to Mass by his wife, his children, his servants; if, as a public man, a magistrate, a sovereign, he exercises a decisive influence on those around him; if, as a minister of religion, he is by his profession bound to teach that which alone is true. Never, assuredly, could one who preaches a religious doctrine, which he knows to be false, boast of being an honest man.

It will be necessary to change some of your habits, to frequent a church hitherto unknown, to form new connections, to confess your sins, to practise certain abstinences. All this may certainly offer some difficulty, but what abundant consolations will at once come to alleviate it; Happy the prodigals, who return from far, from very far, to their father's house. They will receive a greeting, which will excite the jealousy of those of their brethren, who have uniformly continued faithful to his commands. When they are yet a great way off, their father seeing them will run to meet them; and his heart being moved by a lively compassison, he will throw himself into their arms and press them to his heart. "Clothe him," he will say to his servants, "clothe him with the most costly robes, and put a ring on his finger, and shoes on his feet, and

kill the fatted calf, and prepare for us this very day a great feast, with music and dancing, for this my son was dead and is come to life again: was lost and is found."[1] This Father, we know, is God, who pardons all penitent souls. His eagerness to run and meet the prodigal, this is the advances and solicitations of His preventing grace. The embraces, the kisses, which he gives to his child who would prostrate himself at his feet, are those divine bounties, which make the heart of the penitent conscious of his pardon. The servants of this tender Father, who are bidden to welcome His son with so much eagerness and magnificence, are the ministers of the true Church, good shepherds ready to take on their shoulders the stray sheep in order to carry him back to the fold. Those garments and ornaments, which are at once to be given to the penitent, are the prerogatives of innocence, security and peace, the beauty and the joy of the soul; they are also the external rights of a sincere faith and virtue, which God and His Church hasten to bestow on repentance. And that magnificent festival which is accompanied by the music of instruments and of voices, is the banquet of the Eucharist, wherein the very Lamb of God, that bears the sins of the world, makes Himself the food of that soul, which but yesterday was infected by the poison of sin, to-day is fed with the bread of Angels, is placed among the Saints, in the enjoyment of a delight truly heavenly, amid concerts of gladness, the gratulations of the Church on earth and of the Church in heaven. "For there shall be joy," says our Saviour, "before the Angels of God upon one sinner doing penance."[2]

You shrink from returning alone, but no: the path of return has long been traced, and so many choice spirits go over it daily that your conversion, in whatever part of the world it may take place, will not now be a solitary and unheard-of act. The Stolbergs, the de Starcks, the Hallers, the Hurters, the Newmans, the Mannings, &c.,

[1] Luc. xv. 22, etc. [2] Luc. xv. 10.

&c., nearly two hundred graduates of the Anglican universities have prepared the way for you; and how many have made the greatest sacrifices for the confession of the truth! "But," says a venerable bishop,[1] "do not wait for a general movement, that shall carry you along, as it were, in spite of yourself. Too many interests, too many party prejudices, too many anxieties as to wordly affairs, too much half-knowledge, which is more difficult to treat than complete ignorance, oppose themselves to the simultaneous return of the masses. Let fathers of families, whose choice is most frequently a sentence of life or death for their children; let the ministers of religion, who ordinarily decide the belief of a whole population; let the men who write and who govern, those whose talent or social position gives them great influence, impress an impulse instead of waiting for one. A thousand different passions, and especially the despotisms of the old governments, effected the separation and have maintained it for three centuries. One interest alone can end it; the love of truth, an interest little comprehended by the vulgar, but most influential on lofty minds and generous hearts. To such is given the honor of drawing on the masses, and undoing the work of violence and seduction."

I will add only one motive more, but it is a decisive one; your return to the Catholic Church is for you a necessary condition of salvation; the reading of this book ought to have given you a thousand proofs of that necessity.

In conclusion, let us recall the principal one:

Jesus Christ is God; consequently His words have not been spoken in vain, nor for the mere purpose of feeding a barren curiosity. They are the words of infinite truth, of absolute authority. They have revealed to us what it was essentially important for us to know, what we could not be ignorant of or misunderstand without supreme danger to

[1] *Pastoral Instruction of Mgr. Tob. Jenni*, at the beginning of the Entretiens d'Esslinger.

our salvation: God, His nature, His attributes, and His designs in regard to man; man, his fall by sin, his restoration by grace, and the way he must follow in order to pass from sin to justice, and from justice to glory; the God-Man, who is that way, and the aids He gives us in the sacraments and in prayer. This is the summary of the *good tidings* which He came from heaven to announce, and which he preached especially from the cross. Now, even supposing this heavenly Teacher had not said: "He that believeth not (My word) shall be condemned;"— "No one cometh to the Father but by Me;"[1] even if His Apostles had not added "Without faith it is impossible to please God," and again, "There is no salvation in any other,"[2] it is without doubt sufficient for us to know that God has made a revelation of Himself to mankind, in order to know also that we are obliged to believe and to obey His teachings, and that we are threatened with the greatest evils, if we have either the misfortune to be ignorant of them or the audacity to refuse them credence.

The Catholic Church is the only kingdom, which has Jesus Christ for a sovereign; the only family of which He is the father; the only fold which He directs as shepherd; the only bride to which He has forever united Himself; the only body of which He is the head.

The Church, one, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman, has been constituted simply for one end: the salvation to be attained by the mediation of Jesus Christ. It is to lead men to this that she baptizes, remits sins, preaches the gospel to every creature, consecrates and distributes the Eucharist, gives the Holy Ghost, is provided with a sacred hierarchy, is governed by bishops, who define the faith, bind and loose consciences, impose precepts under pain of anathema, and of excommunication, on those who gainsay them. That which results as an evident consequence from this organization of the church, this

[1] Marc. xvi. 16; Joan. xvi. 6. [2] Hebr. xi. 6; Act. iv. 12.

supreme authority accorded by the God-Man to His Pontiffs, is the absolute necessity of belonging to it, in order that we may find salvation in this communion. This is the one only bond, which can attract unbelievers to her, bring back heretics, and keep true believers in her fold. Suppress this, and the Church is destitute of an object, her constitution becomes useless, her authority is annulled, the obligation of submitting to her is absurd. On this view Christ has said to those, whom He has sent forth: "Teach, without any one having to believe you; order, without any one being constrained to obey you; baptize whoever likes to be washed by your hands; make laws, adding to each that it is allowable to disregard it; bind and loose, remit and retain sins, receive into the church or cut off from the church, all as an amusement and to give you the air of doing something. When I said, 'As My Father sent Me, I also send you,' . . . 'He that believeth not shall be condemned,' . . . 'Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' . . . 'If a man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican,'[1] &c., &c., I meant that all religions were indifferent in My eyes, and that I granted full liberty to all and each to make a creed and a decalogue for themselves, and to worship according to their own choice."

No, no, it is not so; the Lord has not pulled down with the one hand what he built with the other: the sovereign Truth has not said yes and no, *it is* and *it is not*, in the same breath.[2] By constituting a government, the God-Man condemned arbitrariness and anarchy; by instituting a Church, He proscribed sects; by giving this Church its one function, the carrying out of the salvation of mankind, He did not allow the salvation of man to be possible out of her pale. In charging her to preserve the divine revelation secure from all error, and to

[1] Joan. xx. 21; Marc. xvi. 16; Joan. iii. 5; Matth. xviii. 17.
[2] 2 Cor. i. 18.

propagate the knowledge of it through the whole world, He did not destroy the only means of preserving and propagating it, which He could give, in this necessary sanction: "He that refuses to believe shall be condemned;" which is equivalent to saying: By voluntary heresy, schism or unbelief, that is, out of the Church,[1] there is no salvation. Accordingly by St. Paul heretics are called, "men that are perverted, and self-condemned,"[2] and by St. John, "antichrists" and "seducers," who lose God by not continuing in the doctrine of Christ;"[3] and by St. Jude, deceivers, "for whom is reserved the storm of darkness forever;"[4] and by St. Peter, "lying teachers, who bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord, who bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction."[5]

The doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers is the same: "The supporter of a schism has no part in the kingdom of God," says St. Ignatius the martyr; he had already said, "All who are of God and Jesus Christ are with the bishop."[6] "They who embrace the doctrines of error, I mean heresies, find their ruin there," says St. Theophilus.[7]

St. Cyprian imputes the origin of heresy to the forgetting of those words addressed to St. Peter; "On this rock will I build my church." Separated from its head, the body falls into dissolution." "This stain of schism and heresy," he says, is not washed away even by suffering and blood. He cannot be a martyr, who is not in the Church: no one can attain to the kingdom, who forsakes her to whom the kingdom will be given." And again: "Whoever, having separated from the Church joins an adultress, is cut off from the promises of the Church. He who leaves the Church of Christ shall not attain to the rewards of Christ: he is an alien, he is profane, he is an enemy. He can no more have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother. If any one could

[1] Perrone, *de vera relig.* part ii. prop. xi.
[2] Tit. iii. 10, 11.
[3] 2 Joan. 7 and 9; 1 Joan. ii. 18.
[4] St. Jude. 13 and 22.
[5] 2 Petr. ii. 1.
[6] *Ad Philadelph.* c. iii.
[7] *Ad Autolyc.* ii. 14.

have escaped, who was not in the ark of Noah, then may he escape, who is out of the Church .... He who holds not this unity, holds not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, holds not life and salvation. The people of Christ can no more be torn asunder than was His vesture ... Rahab, to whom it was said, "Gather thy father and mother, and brethren, and all thy kindred into thy house: whosoever shall go out of the door of thy house, his blood shall be upon his own head," was a figure of the church ..... The flesh of Christ and the holy of the Lord cannot be outside the house, and there is no home for believers except the one Church."[1]

St. Jerome wrote to Pope Damasus: "Following no chief but Christ, I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter, I know that the Church is built upon this rock. Whosoever eats the lamb out of that house is profane. Whoever is not in the ark of Noah, will perish when the deluge prevails."[2]

And St. Augustine: "He who is not one of the members of Christ cannot have christian salvation. But the members of Christ are united to one another by the charity of unity, and by the same do they hold fast to their Head which is Christ Jesus!" And in another place: "Out of the Catholic Church everything may be found except salvation;" and lastly, "If you are separated from the Church, you would be punished with everlasting torments, even should you be burned alive for the name of Christ."[3]

"The holy Church universal declares that out of her pale there is no salvation," says St. Gregory.[4]

Calvin, Beza and Melancthon acknowledged this principle. "They only that are citizens of the household of

[1] *De unit. Ecclesiæ.* [2] Epist. lvii.

[3] *Epist. ad Catholicos contra Donatistas, Vulgo de Unit. Ecclesiæ.*, c. 2; *Serm. ad Epist.* 173, alias 204 *ad Donat. Presbyt.*

[4] *Moral.* lib. xiv. c. 5.

the church," said Calvin, "receive the remission of their sins."[1] And again: "To separate from the church is to renounce God and Jesus Christ, and it is impossible to conceive a more atrocious crime than by a perfidious sacrilege to break the union which the Son of God has vouchsafed to contract with humanity."[2] In his catechism he says: "Q. Why is the article of the remission of sins put after that of the church? A. Because no one obtains the pardon of his sins, unless he is incorporated with the people of God, and perseveres in unity and communion with the body of Jesus Christ, and by this means is one of the true members of the church. Q. Is there then nothing to look for out of the church but condemnation and death? A. No; because those who separate themselves from the society of the faithful to form sects must not expect salvation so long as they are separate."

Is it necessary to belong to the true church in order to be saved: asks Melancthon.[3] "Assuredly, it is necessary," is his answer.

"They are strangers to the faith," says Beza,[4] "who are strangers to Jesus Christ, and they are strangers to Jesus Christ, who are not members of His body, that is, His church."

The Belgian, Helvetic and Anglican confessions of faith maintain the same doctrine.

And in fact, outside of Catholic unity, where are we to find that proposing of truth by the Church whereby we can believe in divine revelation with a supernatural faith, and those precious guarantees, which we ought to obtain for ourselves, if we have our salvation at heart?—guarantees that our sins have been remitted by baptism duly administered or by valid absolution, that we have the bread of life for our food, that the Holy Spirit is given us, that men will not dare to separate by divorce those whom God has united forever, that extreme unction and

[1] *Instit.* l. iv. c. 1. n. 20.
[2] *Instit.* l. iv. c. 1. n. 10.
[3] *Exam. ordin. tit. de Eccles.*
[4] *In Confess. fidei.* c. v. § 1.

the viaticum will open for us the gates of heaven, that we are not taking part in a false worship, that we are not protesting against truth and justice, that, in short, we possess the true faith, the true sacraments, the true worship in the bosom of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

But what then is to become of men, estimable for their many virtues, who are outside the pale of the Catholic Church? God, undoubtedly, urges them to submit to authority, to join themselves to unity, to walk in the ways of sanctity; and many of them will have this happiness before they die.—But those who have died in schism? —We do not judge any persons, we only state the truths, which are to judge both them and us. These truths are that salvation is a grace, . . but that God does not refuse this grace to one who, on his own part, does all that he can . . . that faith is necessary in order to please God, but that negative unbelief, that is to say, an invincible ignorance of revealed truths, is not a sin. . . That no one enters heaven, unless his sins have been forgiven him, but that the desire of baptism joined to perfect contrition—both one and the other including a sincere wish to obey Jesus Christ and to belong to His Church,—obtain the remission of sins, and justify before God. These principles cannot be contradictory, because they are alike true. They have been admirably summed up in these words of Pius IX.: "You know," he said in his Encyclic to the bishops of Italy, dated Aug. 10, 1863, that they who are under an invincible ignorance in regard to our holy religion, but yet observe faithfully the law of nature and the principles that are engraven by the hand of God on the hearts of all men, and who habitually lead an honest life in obedience to God, may also by the divine light and grace attain to eternal life; for God does not inflict everlasting punishment on those, who are not willingly culpable." These principles ought to make us enter with promptitude into the external communion of the Catholic Church, and fill us with the liveliest solicitude for those,

who are still alienated from her; they forbid us to pronounce a decision respecting the lot of such and such a person; a decision which God reserves for Himself. Such a one, whom we imagine to have died in unbelief, has been translated through the holy dispositions of his soul into the bosom of the Church; such another, who is even now a persecutor, will ere long be an Apostle.

But this is a harsh doctrine?

No, surely, for it is divine. *He who believeth not shall be condemned!* No, for it promises grace—grace which God is not bound to give to any one—to a man, who does all in his power to please Him. No, since it absolves invincible ignorance from sin, and does not apply the name of heresy except to obstinacy in error. No, since it attributes to the sincere desire of baptism the efficacy of baptism itself, and to perfect contrition the power of reconciling us to God. No, for it is evident that belief in error cannot have the same salutary virtue as faith in the truth. It is not a hard doctrine, for it is only equivalent to saying: Apart from truth, apart from justice, there is no salvation. No, for, in fine, the Church has received the command to baptize all nations, to preach the Gospel to every creature, a mission, which she has never ceased to fulfil with as much success as zeal. At the same time, every human being is free; every nation, if we consider the laws and the acts of its government as the expression of the will of all, is free also. God wills the salvation of all nations and all individuals, by the application of the merits of Jesus Christ, made in the bosom of the Catholic Church; He wills it, but without prejudice to that essential attribute of man, which renders him worthy of merit and glory, namely, free will.

But, after all, you say, Protestants show less intolerance and do not exclude Catholics from salvation. It is so, indeed; and Henry IV of France was overcome by this simple argument: "Since, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, I cannot find salvation in the sects

separated from her; and according to that of these same sects, I may be saved in the Catholic Church, I will take the safe side: I will return to the faith of my fathers." It is undeniable, that we believe all the truths which saved the Christians of the first ages, all the truths contained in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed, and in that of St. Athanasius, all the articles which Protestants formerly called *fundamentals*; it is certain that none of the sacraments recognized by Christian antiquity are wanting among us, none of the hierarchial grades venerated since the Apostolic age, &c. Protestants could not then exclude us from salvation on any pretext. Accordingly at the present day they no longer do it. They rather condemn themselves out of their own mouth; for, however little authority they still allow to their confessions of faith, to the Institutes of Calvin, or his catechism, to the creed of St. Athanasius preserved by the Lutherans, the Anglicans, &c., they must shudder when, after the enumerations of certain propositions which their fathers believed, but which they no longer believe, they read this anathema; "This is the Catholic faith which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved."[1] A Calvinist, if he believes the catechism of Calvin, condemns the Lutheran, and yet joins in the Supper with him: the Lutheran, in his turn, in virtue of his Confession of faith, excommunicates the Calvinists with whom he *communes*; and the Anglican cannot recite the creed of St. Athanasius without reprobating them both . . In theory the sectaries condemn those who condemn them, in order to prove that they have positive convictions, fixed and grounded on revelation; in practice, they all unite, that they may be stronger against us. This is the whole secret of their tolerance.

As to the doctrinal intolerance of the Catholic Church, an intolerance which has never falsified itself, the thoughtful observer may see therein a fresh evidence of

[1] Symbol. St. Athanas. v. ult.

the divinity of her faith. He has but to call to mind a well known history.

Two mothers were brought before Solomon.[1] They disputed with equal warmth for a babe, which each claimed as her own. They were living under the same roof, and both nursing infants of the same age. One of them having accidently smothered her babe during the night, had placed the dead child in the arms of her neighbor, and taken the living one as her own. The true mother claimed her child with ardent eagerness. To which should it be adjudged, since neither the crime nor the right could be discovered, as the babe could not yet discern its mother by her smile? Let it be cut in two, is the judgment of Solomon, and as the rights are equal, let each mother have half. No! no! cries one of the women no division! my child belongs wholly to me, let it live! This was a mother's cry. No one could misunderstand it, no one ventured to reproach this poor mother with selfishness, or intolerance, or disdainful haughtiness. On the contrary, the pretended mother, she who had smothered her own child and stolen the other, accepts the sentence and replies: Let us divide it!—and by these words alone manifests her guilt. Every one saw clearly that the infant, whom she was thus sacrificing was not her own; that she had not borne in her womb nor fed at her breast the babe which she consented to see slaughtered before her eyes.

The application is easy. Let every sect which has made for itself a creed consent to remake it, to modify it, to sacrifice some articles of its belief to the necessity of union and peace, and forbear condemning those who contradict it; this is what we might anticipate; all separatists act thus, as soon as they find it is for their interest to do so. But the religious society which Jesus Christ has established as the depository of His teachings, His sacraments, His powers, and to which He said: "Teach

[1] III Reg. iii.

all nations, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you . . . He that heareth you, heareth me . . . He that believeth not shall, be condemned . . . He that refuses to hear the Church, let him be to you as a heathen and a publican." . . ah! you have a sure token, by which to distinguish her among all the others. See if she obstinately refuses to surrender a single portion of the sacred deposit; if in her view division is death; if she goes on repeating from age to age after Jesus Christ, without dissimulation and without respect for man, those words: "He that believeth not shall be condemned!" See whether she says openly and everywhere, like Peter at the first preaching of the Gospel: "There is no salvation but in Jesus Christ alone." By this token it will be easy for you to distinguish her with certainty. Examine then and compare the language and attitude of the Catholic Church and of the rival sects, and judge with the discernment and wisdom of the great king.

III.

Ceremony of the reconciliation of Heretics with the Church.

You have pronounced your decision: you have said with the prodigal: "I will arise and return to my father's house." A worthy priest has received the happy tidings of your approaching return. He has soon dissipated your last doubts, and removed the difficulties in practice, which had deterred you. His kind reception has been a powerful encouragement, and you have already the presentiment that under his direction you will find abundance of light and peace and spiritual joy. And now allow this enlightened guide to lead you by the hand.

He has provided himself with the necessary powers. You may therefore, in order to be absolved *in foro interiori*, make to him the secret confession of the grievious sins of your past life. In this self-accusation you will proceed

with simplicity, frankness and courage, being assured that you will do it well, if you have a sincere good-will.

This accusation would be dispensed with, if, returning from infidelity rather than heresy, you had to receive Baptism absolutely and without condition. Generally, in reconciling to the Church *heretics* properly so called, there would be no question about the repetition of Baptism. It is matter of faith that this sacrament, conferred according to the institution of Jesus Christ, even by a heretic, is valid; but it is equally certain that different sects do not now baptize at all; and that many others baptize invalidly. The Protestant therefore who returns to unity may, in too many cases, have well founded doubts as to the validity of the baptism, which he has received. Benedict XIV. has pointed out the course to be pursued in such a case, by those who are to be reconciled to the Church. He expresses himself thus in his treatise *de Synodo Diocesana*.[1]

"The bishop of a diocese, in which christians baptized by heretics seek to abjure their errors and to return to the bosom of the Catholic Church,—when he doubts, and we know that in some places this doubt has arisen, whether they ought to be baptized a second time, under conditions,—should not order anything in so serious and difficult a matter, before inquiring carefully whether, in the heretical sect, from which these christians are returning, any innovation has been made as to the matter or form of Baptism established by our Lord. For if it is certain that the false ministers of that sect use both form and matter aright, he cannot allow the Baptism to be repeated in any way whatever without himself falling under suspicion of the error of the *rebaptizers*, condemned by St. Stephen I; and also according to the testimony of St. Augustine, by a general Council .... If he obtains a positive assurance, that in this sect natural water is not used, or that the Holy Trinity is not invoked, in a word

[1] Lib. vii. c. 6. n. 7.

that the mode followed is different from the institution of Jesus Christ, let him order the Baptism to be performed afresh, absolutely. If, after diligent inquiries, he cannot ascertain the truth with certainty, and consequently, the validity of the Baptism conferred by the heretical minister remains in his judgment doubtful and uncertain, it will be necessary in that case to repeat it under condition, according to the declaration made by the Sacred Congregation of the Council. The question was proposed to the Congregation, whether hereties converted to the faith, should be baptized conditionally, and in what case? The Congregation replied, March 27, 1683: That they were not to be rebaptized unless there was a probable doubt of the invalidity of their Baptism."

Moroni remarks, that when Baptism is to be conferred on heretics, it is administered after they have made the abjuration of their errors.[1]

The Pontifical contains a form for external reconciliation with the Church, which is used by the Bishop, but only in certain cases and when he considers it suitable and opportune. We insert it here, not to prepare those of our brethren, who return to us for receiving it, as they may be restored to the family of God without this ceremony, but to afford them a subject for touching meditations.

The Bishop, wearing as a mark of joy, an alb, a white stole and cope, is seated on a faldstool before the door of the church. The christian admitted to the benefit of reconciliation kneels before him, and the Bishop puts these questions to him: Q. Dost thou believe the twelve articles of the creed? A. I do believe them. Q. Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary? A. I do. Q. Dost

[1] *Dizionario d'erudizione Storico. Ecclesiastica*, under the word *Abjura*.

thou believe that He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe that He descended into hell? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe that He rose the third day from the dead? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe that He ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe that He will come to judge the living and dead? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe the holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe in the remission of all sins? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe in the resurrection of the flesh and everlasting life? A. I do.

Then the Bishop rises, wearing his mitre, and, in the name of God, the Father Almighty, of Jesus Christ His Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he commands the spirit of error to go out of this servant of God, whom the Lord has vouchsafed to deliver from his errors, and to bring back to our holy mother, the Catholic and Apostolic Church. He then makes the sign of the cross on his forehead saying: "Receive the sign of the Cross of Christ, and of the christian religion; the sign which you have received and have not kept, but, being miserably deceived, have denied."

Then the penitent rises, and the bishop taking his right hand in his own left, says: "Enter into the Church of God, from which thou hast incautiously wandered; and acknowledge that thou hast escaped the snares of death; abhor idols; repudiate all heretical perversity and superstition. Worship God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ His Son, and the Holy Ghost, the one, living, and true God, the holy and indivisible Trinity."

At these words the bishop, still holding him by the hand, introduces him into the church, and leads him to the steps of the high altar. There, while the prodigal child falls on his knees, the good father, standing before him, with head uncovered, prays thus:

"Almighty everlasting God, receive with Thy fatherly pity this sheep, whom Thy power has delivered from the jaws of the wolf; and by Thy merciful kindness restore him to Thy flock; that the enemy may not exult in the destruction of Thy children; but that Thy Church may rejoice over his conversion and deliverance, as a loving mother at the recovery of her son." A. Amen.

"Let us pray.

"O God, who mercifully restorest man, whom Thou didst wonderfully create according to Thine own image, graciously look upon this Thy servant, that Thy gracious indulgence may forgive and absolve all that has been withdrawn from Thee by the blindness of his ignorance, and by the fraud of our enemy, the devil; that this Thy servant may receive the communion of the truth, and be restored to Thy altars: Through Jesus Christ our Lord." A. Amen.

The Bishop, a second time questions him on the Catholic faith in these words:

Q. Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth? A. I do. Q. And dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was born and suffered? A. I do. Q. Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and everlasting life after death? A. I do. Q. Dost thou renounce Satan and his angels? A. I renounce them. Q. Dost thou renounce every heretical sect? A. I do. Q. Dost thou wish to be and to live in the unity of the holy Catholic Faith? A. I do.

Then the Bishop, putting off his mitre, rises, and laying his right hand on the head of his prodigal child who is kneeling before him, says:

"Let us pray,

"O Lord God almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has mercifully vouchsafed to deliver this Thy servant from the falsehood of heresy, and to recall him to

Thy Church, send down upon him, O Lord, the Holy Ghost the Comforter." A. Amen.

"The Spirit of wisdom and understanding." A. Amen.

"The Spirit of counsel and strength." A. Amen.

"The Spirit of knowledge and piety." A. Amen.

"Fill him with the light of Thy brightness, and in the name of the same Jesus Christ our Lord, let him be signed with the sign of the cross unto everlasting life."

He makes the sign of the cross upon him, and then the reconciled person, kneeling, makes the profession of his faith and the abjuration of his errors in words such as these: I, N., with a knowledge of the true catholic and apostolic faith, do hereby publicly anathematize every heresy, and particularly that of which I have hitherto borne the ill name, which endeavors to establish (here he mentions some particular errors which he had followed); and I agree with the holy Roman Church and the Apostolic See: I profess with my mouth and with my heart that I believe (here he states the doctrines opposed to the errors he had held), and that I hold the same faith which the holy Roman Church on the authority of the Gospel and the Apostles delivers to be held; swearing this by the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity, on the holy and sacred gospels of Jesus Christ: as to those who contradict this faith, I declare them with their dogmas and their followers worthy of eternal anathema. And if I myself, from which may God preserve me, should ever presume to have a sentiment or utter a doctrine contrary to these holy truths, may I incur all the severity of the canons."

After these words he places his two hands on the book of the Gospels, and holding his fingers joined he says: "And so may God help me and this His holy Evangel!"

Then the Bishop blesses him, making on him the sign of the cross.

IV.

The Profession of Faith, called of Pius IV., or Symbol of the Council of Trent.

During the first ages of the Church, says Benedict XIV.,[1] no neophyte was baptized without a previous formal profession of faith and of renunciation of the heresies of his time. St. Cyprian,[2] Tertullian,[3] Eusebius,[4] St. Augustine,[5] bear witness to this custom. Another constant ceremony was that of exacting a particular profession of faith from suspected Catholics, heretics returning to the Church and bishops when newly appointed, as is proved by many examples cited in St. Cyril of Alexandria,[6] and Christianus Lupus.[7]

In conformity with this custom many rituals require the newly reconciled to recite, instead of the formula in the pontifical, the profession of faith, called of Pius IV. I will subjoin it here with some notes, which will render it more easy of comprehension and more complete.

These notes will be confined to two heads: *truths defined, and errors condemned.* Their substance is taken from a work published by the Theological Faculty of Louvain, so celebrated in the war it waged against heresy. The doctrines of the Church defined by the Council and the opposite errors of the Reformers or others are clearly stated.

[1] Profession of Faith of Pius IV. [2] Epist. lxxvi. *ad Magnum.*
[3] *De Baptismo*, c. vi. [4] *Epist. ad Cæsar. apud Socratem.* l. 1, c. 8.
[5] *Confess.* l. viii. c. 2. [6] *Epist. ad Acacium.*
[7] *In Scholiis ad canones Ephesinos.*

FORM OF PROFESSION OF FAITH.

Extracted from the Bull Injunctum of Pius IV., and otherwise called

The Creed of the Council of Trent.

Ego, N., firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula, quæ continentur in symbolo, fidei quo sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur; videlicit:[1]

I, N., with firm faith believe and profess all and everything contained in the symbol of faith used by the Holy Roman Church; that is to say:[1]

[1] In order to bring before the reader's mind as briefly as possible the principal proofs which demonstrate the truth of our profession of faith, we have added in notes under the two heads: *Developments of Catholic Doctrine* and *Errors condemned*, the summary of the work entitled: *Professio fidei Catholicæ ex sacra scriptura et antiquitate illustrata*, which is appended to the controversial treatises of the *Brothers of Walenburch*, and which appears to be the work of the celebrated faculty of theology at Louvain.

Credo in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, factorem cæli et terræ, visibilium omnium et invisibilium,[2] et in unum Dominum

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;[2] and in one Lord Jesus

[2] Development of the Catholic Doctrine.

God is not the author of sin, as the Psalmist says: *Non Deus volens iniquitatem tu es.* (*Ps.* v. 5.)
He does no evil. (*Sophon.* iii. 5.)
He leads no one to do evil. (*Jacob.* i. 13.)

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"It is an idle fiction and a frivolous answer to attribute evil to God's permission, when, according to scripture, he not only wills it, but does it." Calvin, *De ætern. prædest.; Instit.* l. 1. c. 18. §1.

"It is from the Lord that the crimes of the wicked proceed." Calvin, *De ætern Prædest.*

"Why does God willingly allow sin, or rather why does He, by a special design, devote to error those whom He commands to follow the straight path? This is what it is prudent and humble to be ignorant of." *Id. De. occul. Prov.*

"Man, by a righteous impulse of God, does what is forbidden him." Calvin, *Instit.* lib. i. c. 18. §4

"It is clear that God operates in the hearts of men, inclining their wills, whether to good, of his mercy, or to evil, according to their merits." *De ætern Prædest.*

Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia sæcula; Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum, non factum, consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt;[3]

Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, Light of light, true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made;[3] who

[3] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The Son of God is begotten by the Father. "I know my Father," says Jesus Christ, "because I am from Him." *Joan.* vii. 29.

Christ knows all things. Thus the disciples attest: "We know that thou knowest all things." *Joan.* xvi. 30.; and St. Peter, "Lord, thou knowest all things." *Joan.* xxi. 17; see also *Joan.* xviii. 4.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"If the Father has His being of Himself, and the Son from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from both, does it not result from this that there are three essences?"

"The soul of Christ was subject to ignorance." Calvin, *In Luc.* ii. 40; see also *In Matth.* xxiv. 3.

qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cælis ; et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine ; et homo factus est ;[4] crucifixus etiam

for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven ; and became incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary : and was made man;[4] He was crucified

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Christ is a lawgiver: "A new commandment" He says, "I give you," *Joan* xiii, 34. "Bear ye one another's burden," says the Apostle, "and so you shall fulfil the law of Christ," *Gal.* vi. 2. See also *Isai.* xxxiii. 22.

He entered into the cænacle, when the doors were closed. "Jesus, cometh," says St. John, "the doors being shut, and stood in the midst" of the Apostles. *Joan.* xx. 26.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"We deny that Christ is a lawgiver, and that He has given any new law to the world." Calvin's *Antidote* to the Council of Trent, *Can.* xx. and xxi.

"I do not at all concede to the papists that Christ penetrated through closed doors. Calvin *In Joan:* See also *Admon. ad Wesphal.*

pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est ;[5] et

also for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered and was buried ;[5] and the

[5] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Christ died voluntarily: "Thinkest thou that I cannot ask my Father, and He will give me presently more than twelve legions of angels?" *Matth.* xxvi. 53. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, that I may perfect His work." *Joan.* iv. 34.

He did not abandon Himself to despair. "Who did no sin," says St. Peter (I. ii, 22), neither was guile found in His mouth." See also *Hebr.* vii. 26.

He died for the wicked. This is attested by the Apostle (*Rom.* v. 6), by St. Peter (I. iii. 18), and by St. John (I. ii. 2). He has obtained glory by His suffering. "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death: even to the death of the cross; for which reason God hath also exalted Him," (*ad Philip,* ii. 8, 9). "Because of His suffering He is crowned with glory and honor." (*ad Hebr.* ii. 9.)

After His death His soul descended into hell. So St. Irenæus (l. v. c. 31), St. Jerome (*in cap.* ii. *Jonæ*), St. Gregory Nyssen (*Or.* i. *de Resurrect.*) understand those words in St. Matthew; "The Son of man shall be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights." (*Matth.* xii. 40.) So St. Augustine (*Epist.* 164 (al. 99) *ad Evod.*), St. Jerome (*in Ps.* xv.), and Arnobius, (*in Ps.* xv.) explain those words of the Acts: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption." (*Act.* ii. 27). So Tertullian (*de Anima.* c. 25,) has interpreted that passage of St. Paul: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth." (*Ad Ephes.* iv. 19). See also St. Athanasius *de Incarnatione, contra. Apollin.* l. ii. n. 14, 15. The object of His descent into hell, according to the holy Fathers, was the deliverance of the patriarchs and the just men of the Old Testament.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"Christ acknowledged His weakness by fleeing from death." Calvin, (*In Joan*), and afterwards: "The wish which He had expressed in His great distress, He here retracts; after having held out His hand, He draws it back."

"That an expression of despair should have escaped from Christ, seems absurd; it is easy to explain it." Calvin (*In Matth.* xxvii.), and he adds: "Tortured in every part, overwhelmed by despair, He ceases to call on God, He renounces salvation."

"I should like to know how the wicked can eat that flesh of Christ, which was not crucified for them; and how they can drink that blood which was not shed for the expiation of their sins." Calvin. *De vera particip, Christi in cæna.*

"To inquire, as the schoolmen do, whether Christ merited for Himself, is foolish curiosity. It would be time lost to pronounce on it." *Id. Instit.* l. ii. c. 17.

"Christ suffered in hell the punishment of the damned."—"What is eternal for the reprobate was temporary for Him," says the Heidelberg Catechism. See also Calvin, *Instit.* l. ii. c. 16; Luther, *Ep. ad Amsdorf.*

resurrexit tertiâ die, secun dam Scripturas: et ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris: et iterum venturus est cum gloria judicare vivos et mortuos; cuius

third day He rose again according to the Scriptures: and ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father: and is to come again with glory to judge

regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et vivificantem; qui ex Patre Filioque procedit: qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur, et conglorificatur; qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam.[6]

the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified; who spoke by the Prophets. And one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.[6]

[6] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The preaching of the Gospel is not to cease in the Church of Christ. "Go," He said to His Apostles, "teach all nations . . . I am with you all days till the consummation of ages." (*Matth.* xxviii. 19.) "The gospel shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the consummation come." (Matth. xxiv. 14.) See the explanation of these words by St. Augustine (*In Ps.* c. i. *conc.* 2); by St. Hilary (*De Trin.* l. 11); by St. John Chrysostom, (*In Matth. Hom.* xv.); by St. Jerome (*In Matth.* xxiv.)

The Sacraments are always to be administered in the Church. As to Baptism, see *Matth.* xxvii. 19; as to the Eucharist, I. *Cor.* xi. 26. On this latter passage see the explanation of St. John Chrysostom and Theophylact.

The faith is always to be confessed in it, such confession of faith being necessary for the elect, whose training is the object of the existence of the Church See *Philip* ii. 11; *Rom.* x. 10.

The Church is always to be visible. "You are the light of the world, a city seated on a mountain, a light placed upon a candlestick," &c. *Matth.* v. 14, 15. See also *Matth.* xiii. 30 and 38; *Hebr.* xii. 27, &c.; and St. Hilary (*In Matth. cap.* iv.); St. Ambrose (*In Luc.* l. vii. n. 98); St. Chrysostom (*In Matth. Hom.* xv.); St. Augustine (*De Unit. Eccles.* c. xvi. &c.

The Church, in virtue of the promises she has received, is to be preserved from error. "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." *Matth.* xvi. 18. "The church is the pillar and ground of the truth." I. *Tim.* iii. 15. See the application of these texts by St. Augustine, *De Symb. ad catech.* l. i. c. 6; St. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xv. *in cap. xvi. Matth.;* St. Jerome, *In Matth.* xvi.; St.

Gregory, *In Ps. v. Pænit.*; St. Leo, *Serm.* 2 *de Nativ. Petr. et Paul*, &c.

General Councils cannot err, according to the promise of Jesus Christ. *Joan.* xiv. 16 and 26; *Joan.* xvi. 13; *Matth.* xviii. 19; *Luc.* x. 16. See the explanation of these texts in St. Chrysostom, *In cap. xiv. Joan.;* St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joan.* l. x. The first general councils, admitted by Protestants, give their judgments as definitive and unalterable.

Unity is a note of the true Church. *Joan.* xvii. 20–23; *Joan.* xiii. 35, &c. It results from unity of government and of doctrinal teaching. Hence the zeal of the Fathers against schism and heresy. See St. Augustine, *De Civit. Dei.* xviii. 51; St. Cyprian, *Epist.* li. and *De Unit. Eccles.*; St. Hilary, *In Ps.* cxxi. n. 5; St. Basil, *In Ps.* xxviii. n. 3, &c.

Sanctity, attested by miracles, is a note of the true Church. *Marc.* xvi. 17; *Joan.* iii. 2; *Matth.* ix. 6. See also St. Irenæus, ii. 31 and 32; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joan* l. x.

Catholicity is a note of the true Church. (*Matth.* xxiv. 14,) in this sense, that the Church presents in time and space unity without division, while heretics appear only in the state of societies divided and isolated from each other; that it is established for the whole human race, the distinction of Jews and Gentiles being abolished in her and by her, and that, in fine, she is actually diffused over the whole earth, at least relatively. See St. Augustine, *De Civit. Dei.* l. xx. c. 8 and 11); St. Cyprian, *Epist.* lii.; Origen, *C. Cels.* 1, 67, &c.

Apostolicity is a note of the true Church. *Matth.* xxviii. 19; *Ephes.* iv. 11; I. *Joan.* iv. 6. The Fathers understand it of the external succession which connects the existing Bishops and Doctors of the church with the Apostles. See St. Irenæus, l. iv. c. 33, n. 8, and l. iii. 3; St. Augustine, *Adv. Leg. et Prophet.* i. c. xx. n. 39.

Errors condemned.

"From time to time, as in our own days, the Church having fallen into ruins, it has been necessary that God should give some persons an extraordinary mission, in order to raise it up." *Confession of Faith of the French Churches*, art. 31. *Confession of Augsburg, Apol.* fol. 70.

"Among the Papists the true sacraments of the faith have been corrupted, altered, falsified, nay even altogether abolished." *Ibid.* art. 28.

"The church may be called invisible, because, being hidden from our eyes, and known by God alone, it often escapes the observation of man." *Helvetic Confession of Faith*, c. 13; *Scottish Confession*, art. 16.

"It is not astonishing that the church should fall into error, as often as it forsakes God." *Helvetic Confession.* c. 17.

"General Councils, . . . for as much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all are not governed with the spirit and the word of God, many err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God." *Anglican Articles.* art. 21.

"As to the notes of the church, no Protestant confession mentions them. What is more, the *Catalogus testium Veritatis* says that unity is not a proper and certain note of the church.

Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum, et expecto ressurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi sæculi.[7] Amen.	I confess one Baptism for the remission of sins, And I expect the ressurection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.[7] Amen.

[7]DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Baptism conferred by heretics, according to the form and with the intention of the Church, is valid. This, says St. Augustine, is an Apostolical tradition. *De Baptismo C. Donatist.* l. 11. c. 71. See also *Contra Crescon.* l. i. c. 32; and St. Jerome, *C. Lucifer.* c. 6.

Baptism remits sin, *Ephes.* v. 27. *Joan.* iii. 5. *Tit.* iii. 5. See also St. Augustine, *Enchird.* c. 52.

The saints are already in the enjoyment of heavenly beatitude. *Apoc* vii. 14, 15. The Apostle desires "to be separated from the body, in order to be with Jesus Christ." *Philip.* i. 23. See Pseudo Justin, *Quest.* 75; St. Cyprian, *De Exhort Martyr.* c. ult.; Venerable Bede, *In cap.* vi., *Apoc.* &c.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

The reformed confessions in general declare themselves against baptism which has not been conferred by the ministers of the word.

"For the elect the sacraments are helps that assist them to be saved, for the others they are useless," Calvin, *Ineund concord.* p. 1001.

"If you were to baptize with water those who are not of the elect a thousand times, they would not for all that receive either faith or the Holy Ghost," Beza. *Colloq. Mompelg.*

"The Scripture teaching us throughout that all is kept in sus-

pense till the coming of Christ, who defers till then the distribution of the crowns of glory, let us rest in this. Let us believe that the just who have finished their combats await in a happy resting place the enjoyment of the triumph which is promised them, and that all is in suspense till the coming of the Redeemer," Calvin, *Instit.* l. iii. c. 25.

Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector.[8]

I most steadfastly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesistical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church.[8]

[8]DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Apostolic traditions, are to be received. "Hold," says the Apostle, "the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle." II *Thess.* ii. 14. See St. Chrysostom on this passage; St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27, 29. See also I *Cor.* xi. 2, and the explanation of St. Epiphanius, *Hæres.* lxi. §6, *and Hæres.* lxxv. §8; II TIM. i. 13; and St. Chrysostom on this passage.

The laws of the Church are obligatory on the conscience. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." See *Joan.* xx. 21; and St. Chrysostom, *In Joan. Hom.* 85. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." *Luc.* x. 16; *Matth.* xvi 18, and St. Jerome on that passage; *Ep. ad Rom.* c. xiii, and the explanations of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine; *Act.* xv. 28: and *Hebr.* xiii. 17.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"Let this be held for an axiom, that cannot be shaken: The church recognizes no other word of God than that which is contained, first, in the law and the prophets, then in the writings of the Apostles." Calvin. *Instit.* l. iv. c. 8; Second *Helvetic Confession*, c. 1 and 2.

"We repudiate all the laws which would bind our consciences, under the pretext of the service of God." *French Confession*, art. 33.

Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenet et tenuit sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum admitto, nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum, accipiam et interpretabor.[9]

I also receive the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our Holy Mother Church holds and has held, whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, nor will I ever receive and interpret them otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers.[9]

[9]DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

Scripture is to be understood as the Church understands it. Such is the teaching of St. Peter (II *Peter*, 1, 20); and of St. Paul (*Eph.* iv. 11, and I *Tim.* iii. 15). See St. Augustine, *De utilit, credendi*, c. xviii, and Origen, *on Matth. Tr.* xxix, near the end.

It is to the Church that it belongs to judge of the true sense and the legitimate interpretation of Scripture. See the texts indicated above; and *Malach.* li. 7; St. Augustin, *In prolog. de doct. Christi;* St. Irenæus, l. iii. c. 24; St. Hilary, *In Matth.* c. xiii; Origen, who gives the following rule: "That only is to be received as truth, which is in no respect at variance with the traditions of the Church." *De Princp.* l. 1 n. 2.

Scripture is to be interpreted according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. This results from the principles laid down above; and this consequence is admitted by St. Basil *adv. Eunom.* l. i; by St. Leo, *Epist. decretal.* lxi, vii; by Theodoret, *Dialog.* 1, 2 and 3; by St. Augustine, *Contr. Julian. Pelag.* l ii. c. 1.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

Protestants acknowledge no other interpreter of Scripture than their private judgment.

And that right of interpretation which they allow to each individual, they refuse to the Church.

Profiteor quoque septem esse verè et propriè sacramenta novæ legis,[10] a Jesu

I also acknowledge that there are properly and truly seven Sacraments of the New Law,[10] instituted by

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

We are to believe, supported by Scripture and the Fathers, that there are seven Sacraments, established by Jesus Christ our Lord:

Baptism, necessary to salvation, *Joan*, iii. 5—see the explanation of this passage in St. Augustine (*De Peccat. Mer. et Remiss.* l. 1. c: 20 and 30)—and validly administered by laymen: *Scimus etiam licere laicis baptizare*, says St. Jerome (*Contr. Lucifer*, c. 9). See *Act.* viii. 38.

Confirmation, of which St. Luke speaks: (*Act.* viii. 14), explained by St. Jerome (*Contr. Lucif.* c. 9), by Pope St. Innocent, &c.

Eucharist, the greatest of the sacraments. *Matth.* xxvi; *Luc.* xxii; *Joan.* vi, &c. See also St. Augustine, (*In Ps.* xxxiii. n. 10); St. Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, l. iv. c. 4); St. Cyril,(*Catech.* iv), &c.

Penance, preceded by the confession of sins,—which is necessary, (*Jacob*, v. 16), and has been in use from the time of the Apostles. (Many of them that believed came confessing their sins and declaring their deeds (Act. xix. 18),—and consummated by the absolution which really remits sins. (*Matth.* xviii. and xvi. 19). See the explanation of this passage by St. Jerome; see also *Joan*, xx. 22.

Extreme Unction, of which St. James speaks (v. 14), explained by St. Innocent, Pope (in *Epist. ad Decent.*); by St. John Chrysostom, *De Sacerd.* iii. 6), &c.

Order, which the Apostle mentions (I *Tim.* iv. 14), and which, St. Augustine says (in Contra Parmen. l. ii. c. 13), "no one doubted being a sacrament."

Marriage, "a great sacrament," says St. Paul (Eph. v. 32), of which the type is the union of Christ and His Church. St. Augustine speaks highly of its sanctity. De bono conjug. c. xviii. and xxiv.

The sacraments confer grace. *Eph.* v. 26; I. *Petr.* iii. 21; *Tit.* iii. 5; *Act.* ii. 33, and viii. 18. St. Augustine explains these supernatural effects. *Tract*, 80 *In Joan.*

The rites of the Church in the administration of the sacraments, are to be observed. I. *Cor.* xiv. 26, 40.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

Wickliffe teaches that every creature which is an object of sense is a sacrament. *Dialog.* l. iv. c. 1. Calvin says that the imposition of hands, with which the installation of ministers of the Church is accompanied, is a sacrament. *Instit.* l. iv. c. 19, § 28. Luther admits sometimes more, sometimes fewer. Modern Protestants give the name only to Baptism and the Supper.

The reformers maintain, according to Calvin (*Instit.* l. iv. c. 16, § 31), that children born of faithful parents are holy, and are saved without baptism. (Synod of *Dort.*—Thesis of the Lutherans of Mons, A. D. 1645). Baptism, they say, administered by one, who has neither calling nor commission, is completely null. *Discipline of the churches of France*, c. ii. art. 1

They deny that confirmation is a sacrament.

They equally deny the obligation of confessing our sins to the priest; and teach that absolution is confined to declaring that sins are remitted, without remitting them in fact.

"Extreme Unction," says Calvin (Instit. l. iv. c. 19, § 18), "is only a hypocritical jugglery;" "and in another place:" "We set aside marriage from the number of the sacraments." Order is equally suppressed by Protestants.

Christo Domino nostro instituta atque ad salutem humani generis, licét non omnia singulis, necessaria; scilicet Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem Ordinem et Matrimonium; illaque gratiam conferre, et ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem et Ordinem sinè sacrilegio reiterari non posse: receptos quoquè et approbatos Ecclesiæ catholicæ ritus in supradictorum omnium sacramentorum solemni administratione recipio et admitto.

Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all necessary for every one; that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony; and that these confer grace, and that of these Baptism, Confirmation and Order cannot be repeated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

Omnia et singula quæ de peccato originali et de justificatione in sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo definita et declarata fuerunt amplector et recipio.[11]

I embrace and receive all and every thing which has been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent on the subject of Original Sin and of Justification.[11]

[11] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

All that is truly and properly sin is taken away by Baptism. *Eph.* v. 25; I. *Petr.* iii. 21; *Tit.* iii. 5. St. Augustine developes this doctrine, *De peccat. Remiss*, l. 1, c. 30, and *Contr. duas Epist. Pelag.* l. 1, c. 13.

Men are justified by a justice that is inherent in them. *Rom.* viii. 30; *Tit.* iii. 7. See St. Augustine, *De peccat. Remiss.* l. 1. c. 26.

The faithful really merit the crown of glory. II *Tim.* iv. 7, 8; II *Thess.* i. 5, &c.; II. *Cor.* v. 10; *Rom.* ii. St. Augustine refutes the Protestant objections against this doctrine, in his work, *De grat. et lib. arbitrio*, c. vi.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"Original sin, considered as to its guilt, continues sin after baptism; although God, by His gratuitous goodness and mercy, does not impute it to his children." *Conf. Gallic.* art. 11.

"We believe that all our justice (or righteousness) consists in the remission of sins . . . and we reject all other ways of understanding the justification of man." *Ibid.* art. 18. The same article asserts that there cannot be any merit in our virtues and good works.

Profiteor pariter in Missâ offeri Deo verum proprium et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis, atque in sanctissimo Eucharistiæ sacramento esse verè, realiter et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem unà cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus

I also profess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, propitiatiory Sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the the Body and Blood together with the Soul and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a

et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem catholica Ecclesia transsubstantiationem appellat. Fateor etiam sub altera tantùm specie totum Christum verumque sacramentum sumi.[12]

conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also acknowledge that under one only of the species the whole Christ and the true Sacrament is received.[12]

[12] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The sacrifice of the Mass is founded on Scripture, (*Act.* xii. 2,) and in antiquity. See the Council of Chalcedon, *Act.* xi.; and the second Council of Carthage, *Can.* vi.

In the Mass there is offered to God for the living and the dead, a true sacrifice, properly so called, and propitiatory; for the priest does at the altar what our Saviour did at the last Supper, according to the command given by Jesus Christ; "Do this in commemoration of me." *Luc.* xxii. 19. Now the action related by St. Matthew (xxvi. 28.) by St. Mark (xiv. 24.) and by St. Luke (xxii. 20.) is regarded by the fathers as a true sacrifice; by St. Irenæus (l. iv. c. 17 and 18 Calec. 32 and 34;) by St. Cyprian (*ad Cæcilium, Epist.* 63 and 66.) It is in this sense that St. John Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxxiii.) explains that passage of the Apostle: "We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle." *Hebr.* xiii. 10. Theodoret says that "in the tabernacle the victim was devoid of reason, while we have a victim possessed of reason," and as he elsewhere says, "divine." *In Heb.* c. lx. and *Hist. Relig.* c. xx. "It cannot be denied," says St. Augustine (*Enchirid,* c. 110,) "that the souls of the faithful are relieved by the piety of their living friends when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them."

Jesus Christ is truly, really and substantially present in the sacrament of the Eucharist. *Matth.* xxii. 26; *Marc.* xiv. 22; *Luc* xxii. 19; *Joan.* vi. 52; I *Cor.* x. 16; these passages are explained in the Catholic sense by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Myst.* iv.); by Origen (*Hom.* lx. *in Levit.*); in the work, *De Cæn. Domini,* called St. Cyprians; by St. Ambrose (l. iv. *De Sacram.* c. 4.); by St. Hilary, (*De Trinit,* l. viii.)

Jesus Christ is made present in the Eucharist by the *transubstantiation.* This is required by the truth of His words: "This is my body;" so was it understood by the fathers. Of this bread it is said: "*Non effigie sed natura mutatus.*" (*De Cæn. Domini.*) St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. John Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Alexandria make use of the words *change, conversion,—Iste panis transit in corpus Christi,* says St. Remigius (in I *Cor.* x), *nec sunt duo corpora sed unum corpus.*

Errors condemned.

"The sacrifices of Mass, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." *Anglican Articles,* art. 31.

"The flesh of Jesus Christ cannot be eaten corporally without crime and cruelty." *Confess. Helvet.* art 21.

Luther admits a sacramental union between the bread and the body of Jesus Christ. Calvin declares that Luther is inconsistent, and that if he continues to hold the real presence, he cannot repudiate either transubstantiation or the worship of the Eucharist.

Constanter teneo purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari.[13]

I firmly hold there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful.[13]

[13] Development of the Catholic Doctrine.

We believe that there is a purgatory, because there are sins which are remitted in the world to come, as St. Augustine (*De Divit. Dei.* l. xxi. c. 24) concludes from the words of our Lord in *Matth.* xii. 32; and because, according to the teaching of the Apostle (I *Cor.* iii. 15), those who do not build with suitable materials upon the foundation of faith, will attain to salvation, but, as it were, by passing through fire; words which St. Augustine (*In Ps.* xxxvii) explains of the expiations of the other life. See also St. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vii; Origen, *In Jerem. Hom.* xvi.

The souls in purgatory are solaced by the prayers of the faithful. Such was the faith of the Maccabees (II. *Maccab.* xii. 43), of St. Paul (I. *Cor.* xv. 29), of all antiquity. "It was not without good reason," says St. John Chrysostom (*Hom.* III. *in Epist* ad Philip.), "that the Apostles established this law, to wit, that a commemoration of the departed should be made in the awful

mysteries. They knew that much benefit results to them from this, and great help." See also Pseudo—Jerome, *In Cap. xi. Proverb.; Orat.* i. *Præp. ad Missam.* known as St. Ambrose's; St. Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis*, c. 4; and *Enchirid. ad Laurent.* c. 109, &c.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"We look on purgatory as a fable, an invention of Satan." *Confess. Gallic.*, art. 14.

"This application of the Lord's Supper to the deliverance of the dead, being unknown to Scripture or rather contrary to it, ought to be condemned as a new and impious sort of worship." *Confession of Augsburg. Tit. de Missa.*

"We believe that the faithful go straight to Christ after the death of the body, and consequently, have no need of the suffrages of the living, nor of the prayers or offices which they make for the dead." *Confess. Helvet.* after art. 26.

Similiter et Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes venerandos et invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas.[14]

Likewise that the Saints reigning together with Christ are to be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.[14]

[14] DEVELOPMENT OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

It is permitted to honor the saints who reign with Christ. See *Genes.* xix. 1, and the explanation of that passage by St. Augustine, *De Trinit.*, lib. 2, c. 12. See also III. *Reg.* xviii. 7, and the Council of Gangra, *Can.* xx.

It is permitted to invoke them. In the book of Judges (xiii. 28), Manue invokes the angel of the Lord. Jacob, when blessing Joseph's children (*Genes.* xlviii. 16), says: "The angel that delivereth me from all evils, bless these boys, and let my name be called upon them, and the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac." We read in the Apocalypse (i. 4): "Grace be unto you and peace from Him that is, and that was, and that is to come, and from the seven spirits that are before His throne." On these passages, see the explanation of St. Augustine, *De Genes.* l. 1; and of St. Jerome, Comment. *in Ps.* xv.

The relics of the saints ought to be honored. The linen cloths which St. Paul had used worked miracles (*Act.* xix. 11); the mere shadow of St. Peter cured the sick (*Act.* v. 15); Eliseus

used the mantle of Elias to divide the waters (iv. *Reg.* II); his own bones restored life to a dead man (*Ibid.* xiii. 21). From this last circumstance St. Jerome concludes that we ought to honor the relics of the martyrs (*Epist.* cix., al. liii. *ad Ripar*); St. Cyril of Jerusalem draws the same conclusion from it. *Catech.* xviii. etc.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"It is only want of faith which has introduced this practice (of venerating the saints); we believe we are honoring them; we are rather dishonoring them." *Conf. Belg.* art. 26.

"The practice of invoking the saints who have left this world, ought to be disapproved and rejected by the church." *Confession of Augsburg*, art. 21.

"True religion forbids invoking the saints, the inhabitants of heaven, or having recourse to their intercession." *Last Helvetic Confession*, art. 23.

"The Romish doctrine concerning worshipping and adoration . . . of relics, is a fond thing, vainly invented." *Anglican Articles*, art. xxii.

Firmissimé assero imagines Christi ac Deiparae semper Virginis, nec non aliorum sanctorum habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.[15]

I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and also of the other saints ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration ought to be paid them.[15]

[15] DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

It is permitted to have the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary and of the saints, in our churches.

The ark of the covenant, an image of God, was placed in the temple by command of the Lord; it was adorned with two cherubims of gold (*Exod.* xxv.), and Solomon had two others placed in the Holy of Holies. "According to the immaculate faith of christians," says St. Basil, (*Epist. ad Julianum,*) whose words were cited in the second Council of Nice, "I invoke the holy Apostles, prophets, and Martyrs . . . and I honor and venerate their images: this practice has been handed down to us by the Apostles themselves and is spread through all our churches, far from being prohibited."

It is permitted to honor the images of Christ and of the saints. Josue and all the ancients remained until the evening prostrate before the ark, (*Jos.* vii. 6;) David brings it back in great pomp (II. *Reg.* vi.); the Jews venerate the brazen serpent, a figure of the Saviour (*Num.* xxi. 8); "The Jews of old," says St. Jerome, (*Epist.* xlvi. al. xvii. *ad Carcellam*), venerated the Holy of Holies, because the Cherubims were there, and the propitiatory, and the ark of the Testament, the manna and the rod of Aaron, and the golden altar. Do you not think that the sepulchre of the Lord is much more an object of veneration? See also St. Chrysostom, *in Missa.*

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"The use of images in churches ought not to be regarded as useful, or even as indifferent." *Last Helvetic Confess.* art. 27.

The Heidelberg Catechism says that "images ought not to be tolerated in churches." *Question* 98.

"The Romish doctrine concerning . . . worshipping and adoration of images is a fond thing, vainly invented." *Anglican Articles,* art. 22.

Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse illarumque usum christiano populo salutarem esse affirmo.[16]

I affirm also that the power of Indulgences has been left by Christ in the Church and that the use of them is most salutary for the Christian people.[16]

[16]DEPOLPMENTS OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The power of granting indulgences had been given by Jesus Christ to His Church, and the use of them is salutary.

Protestants understand those words: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven," (*Matth.* xvi. 19,) as we do, of the power of remitting sins both as to their guilt and their punishment. The early Councils used the power, whether it were in establishing penances to be undergone, proportioned to each offence, or in abridging the period of expiation for just causes. And so the Apostle himself acted: "What I have granted," he says, speaking of pardon, of indulgence, "for your sake have I done it in the person (or by the authority) of Christ." II *Cor.* ii. 10.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

"The Romish doctrine concerning Indulgences . . . is a fond thing, vainly invented." *Anglican Articles*, art. xxii.

"We reject indulgences, which remit false and supposed penances." *Confession of Augsburg*, art. 11.

Sanctam, catholicam, et apostolicam, romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco, romanoque Pontifici beati Petri apostolorum principis successori a Jesu Christo vicario veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.[17]

I acknowledge the holy catholic and Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all Churches and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman pontiff, the successor of the blessed Peter the prince of the Apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.[17]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

St. Peter was the prince of the Apostles.

He is established as the foundation stone of the Church. *Matth.* xvi. 18. He receives the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the special power of binding and loosing. *Ibid.* He is made the shepherd of the lambs and the sheep. *Joan.* xxi. 15. He presides over the Councils of Jerusalem. *Art.* i. 15.

He is assisted by Heaven in the government of the Church. *Art.* x. 8, &c. See these passages explained in St. John Chrysostom (*Hom.* lxxxvii. *In Joan.*); in St. Basil (In *procemio de Judic.* Dei.); in St. Augustine (*In Ps.* cviii.); in Hilary (In *Matth.*, c. xvi.); in St. Cyprian, (*Epist.* lxxi.), &c.

The Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter.

We see in St. Matthew (xvi. 18,) and in St. John (xxi. 15), an ordinary office established by Jesus Christ for the benefit of the Church, and consequently, like her, perpetual. Now he who has succeeded St. Peter in this office is, according to all tradition, none other than the Roman Pontiff. "As that which Peter believed in Christ is permanent," says St. Leo. (*Serm.* ii. *de Assumpt.*), so what Christ instituted in Peter is permanent." . . . His power lives and his authority is permanent in his own See. "Why," says St. Chrysostom (*the sacred*, l. ii., n. 1), "why did Christ shed His blood? To purchase that flock the care of which He has entrusted to Peter and to his successors." "God has

placed you on the Apostolic See" wrote St. Augustine and the Council of Milevis (*Epist.* clxxiv.) to Pope Innocent, &c. Besides, the Protestants have never assigned any other succesor to Peter.

ERRORS CONDEMNED.

Peter, the Protestants say, was not the prince of the Apostles. Far from being his successor, the Pope is Antichrist. Luther. *Captiv. Babylon;* art. *Smalcald.* iv; Calvin. *Instit.* iv; *Last Helvetic Confession.* art. 17.

Cætera item omnia a sacris canonibus et œcumenicis conciliis et præcipue a sacrosancta Tridentina synodo tradita, definita et declarata indubitanter recipio ac profiteor.

And also all other things that have been taught, defined and declared by the sacred Canons and œcumenical Councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess.

Simulque contraria omnia atque hæreses quascumque ab Ecclesia damnatas, rejectas et anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio, anathematizo.

And at the same time all things contrary thereto, and whatever heresies have been condemned, rejected and anathematized by the Church, I likewise condemn, reject and anathematize.

Hanc veram catholicam fidem extra quam nemo salvus esse potest; quam in præsenti sponte profiteor et veraciter teneo, et eam integram et inviolatam usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissime, Deo adjuvante, retineri et confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel

This true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved, which I now, of my own accord, profess, and truly hold, I promise, vow and swear that I will, by God's help, most resolutely retain and profess to my last breath, and that I will take care, so far as lies in

illis quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit teneri, doceri, et prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem spondeo, voveo ac juro.

Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc sancta Dei Evangelia!

me, that the same be held, taught and preached by those who are subject to me, or of whom the care shall belong to me in respect of my office.

So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God!

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION 1
INTRODUCTION 11

CHAPTER I.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH AND ITS HEAD ..... 31—53
1.—Idea of faith 31
2.—On the relation between private judgment and faith 33
3.—On faith in the Church. To refuse to be in any church whatever, be the character and proofs of its divine mission what they may, would be culpable unbelief 36
4.—To believe in any church whatsoever, would be unreasonable credulity 39
5.—To believe in the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which justifies, by these characteristics, the obligation it imposes on us of recognizing its authority, is the only true, the only reasonable faith in the Church 46

CHAPTER II.

PROOFS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH ..... 54—73
1.—The authority of the Church confirmed by the testimony of the books which relate to its constitution 54
2.—The authority of the Church confirmed by its whole history 63
3.—Conclusions from the first two chapters 72

CHAPTER III.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.—*First, Second and Third sessions* ..... 74—102
1.—On Councils in general 74
2—The convocation of the Council of Trent.—The liberty it enjoyed —Its acceptance by the Church 78
3.—Authority of the Council of Trent.—This Council is the legitimate representation of the whole Church 85
4.—A brief view of Protestant Councils, compared with the Council of Trent.—Synod of Dort in 1618. Synod of Lausanne in 1838. Synod of Paris in 1848, &c 93
5.—First, second and third sessions of the Council of Trent,—decrees on the Profession of Faith 101

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.—*Fourth session of the Council*....103—147
1.—Of the Church and Scripture..... 103
2.—Relations of the Church and Scriptures..... 104
3.—Of the relations between the Scriptures and the Church.. 126
4.—Of heresy in its relation to Scripture..... 135

CHAPTER V.

ON TRADITION.—*Fourth session of the Council*,.....148—163
1.—True idea of Catholic Tradition..... 148
2.—Authority of Tradition..... 150
3.—Sources of Tradition.—How to distinguish Divine and Apostolic Traditions from those which are not such..... 158
4.—Decree of the Council of Trent concerning the Canonical Scriptures..... 162

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE HOLY TRINITY.....164—194
1.—Ideas respecting the Holy Trinity supplied by the Creed of the Catholic Church..... 164
2.—Proofs of this Mystery found in Scripture..... 167
3.—Proofs supplied by tradition..... 170
4.—Reflections on the mystery of the Trinity..... 174
5.—Variations of Protestants on the doctrines of the Trinity.. 189

CHAPTER VII.

ON ORIGINAL SIN.—*Fourth session of the Council*.....195—215
1.—On the natural and supernatural in man..... 195
2.—The primitive state of man was a supernatural state..... 199
3.—Sin and fall of the first man..... 200
4.—On the transmission of this sin..... 203
5.—The remedy of Original Sin.—The immaculate Conception of Mary..... 210
6.—Decree of the Council concerning Original Sin..... 213

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.....216—268
1.—Design of God in the Redemption.—Principal facts in the mystery of the Incarnation..... 216
2.—Testimony of Jesus Christ: or of the Son of God in favor of His divinity..... 223
3.—Testimony of the Father: or proof of the Divinity of the Saviour dra vn from His miracles..... 220

4.—Testimony of the Holy Ghost; or, proofs of the Divinity of Jesus Christ derived from the fulfilment of the Prophecies, and the conversion of the world in the time of the Apostles..... 243
5.—Variations of Protestants on the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the fundamental dogma of Christianity..... 257

CHAPTER IX

On Justification.—*Sixth Session*.....269— 304
1.—The Catholic doctrine on Justification. Its nature, its causes, its developments, &c..... 269
2.—Decree of the Council on Justification..... 281
3.—Errors and variations of Protestants on Justification..... 292
4.—Canons of the Council on this dogma..... 300

CHAPTER X.

On the Sacraments.—*Seventh Session*.....305—331
1.—What the Sacraments become from the point of view of Justification by Faith only..... 306
2.—Nature of a Sacrament and its analogies with the Incarnation. 308
3.—Of the institution and number of the Sacraments..... 316
4.—Efficacy of the Sacraments..... 319
5.—On the minister of the Sacraments..... 322
6.—On the Ceremonies used in administering them..... 325
7.—Canons of the Council on the Sacraments in general..... 330

CHAPTER XI.

On Baptism.—*Seventh Session of the Council*.....332—563
1.—Reason of the institution of Baptism.—The matter, form, minister, effect, necessity of it.—Irrevocable obligation contracted thereby..... 332
2.—Errors and variations of Protestants on the subject of Baptism..... 343
3.—Canons of the Council relative to Baptism..... 353
4.—Ceremonies of Baptism..... 355

CHAPTER XII.

On Confirmation.—*Continuation of the Seventh Session*.....364—381
1.—Institution of Confirmation. A Sacrament distinct from Baptism..... 364
2.—Advantages of this Sacrament. Means to be used for drawing to us and preserving in us the Spirit of God..... 368
3.—Ceremonies of Confirmation..... 374

4.—Errors of Protestants concerning Confirmation; and Canons of the Church condemning these errors..... 381

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist—*Thirteenth, Twenty-first and Twenty second Sessions*..... 384—471
1.—Of Sacrifice in general..... 384
2.—Of The Eucharistic Sacrifice. The promise and institution of it according to Scripture..... 387
3.—The testimony of Tradition..... 392
4.—Consequences of Transubstantiation in relation to Communion under one kind only..... 400
5.—The analogy of this Mystery with the dogmas, the morals, the dicipline and the worship of Christianity..... 405
6.—Summary explanation of the principal Ceremonies of the Mass..... 432
7.—The errors and variations of Protestants on the dogma of the Eucharist..... 447
8.—Decree and canons of the Council on the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Doctrine and canons relative to Communion under both species. Doctrine and canons relative to the Sacrifice of the Mass..... 456

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance.—*Fourteenth Session*..... 472—519
1.—Institution of the Sacrament of Penance found in Scripture and Tradition..... 472
2.—Benefits of this Divine Institution..... 483
3.—Ceremonies of the Sacrament of Penance..... 499
4.—Errors and variations of Protestants on this dogma..... 503
5.—Decree and canon of the Council relative to the Sacrament of Penance..... 507

CHAPTER XV.

Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction—*Continuation of the Fourteenth Session*.....520--540
1.—Divine institution of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.. 520
2.—Ceremonies in administering it..... 524
3.—Benefits of this Sacrament..... 530
4.—Errors and Variations of Protestants with regard to Extreme Unction..... 535
5.—Doctrines and canons of the Council relative to the Sacrament of Extreme Unction..... 538

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER. *Twenty-third Session*.....541—571
1.—Of the Priesthood in general. How by its mere existence it would be sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity.... 541
2.—Institution of the Sacrament of Order..... 544
3.—Powers of the Priest. Obligation to continence imposed on him..... 549
4.—Ceremonies of Ordination..... 553
5.—Errors and variations of Protestants respecting the Sacrament of Order..... 559
6.—Doctrine and canons of the Council relative to the Sacrament of Order..... 568

CHAPTER XVII.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE. *Twenty-fourth session*.. ..572—607
1.—Christian Marriage, having become the sign of the Incarnation, and conferring grace, is a Sacrament..... 575
2.—The properties of Christian Marriage. Impediments arising from the Divine law and the law of the Church. Evils of mixed marriages..... 577
3.—Ceremonies of the Sacrament of Marriage..... 589
4.—Marriage submitted to the pretended Reformation..... 592
5.—Doctrine and canons of the Council relative to the Sacrament of Marriage..... 605

CHAPTER XVIII.

OF PURGATORY. *Twenty fifth Session*..... 608—624
1.—Existence of Purgatory. Proofs derived from Scripture and tradition..... 608
2.—Advantages of this doctrine. Consolations which it affords 615
3.—Errors of Protestants respecting Purgatory..... 618
4.—Definitions and Decrees of the Council regarding Purgatory 623

CHAPTER XIX.

ON INDULGENCES. *Twenty-fifth Session*.....655—630
1.—The true idea of Indulgences. The power possessed by the Church of granting them..... 625
2.—Advantages which Christian society derives from the Indulgences of the Church..... 640
3.—Variations and contradictions of Protestants on this doctrine 633
4.—Declaration of the Council relative to Indulgences..... 640

CHAPTER XX.

On the worship and invocation of the Virgin and the Saints. On Relics, Images, &c.—*Continuation of the Twenty-fifth Session*.....641—671
1.—In what the worship which we pay to the Saints consists. Justification of it from Scripture and Tradition..... 641
2.—On the invocation of the Saints, and the grounds which authorize it..... 647
3.—Justification of the worship of honor, and invocation paid to Mary..... 654
4.—Practice of the worship of the Saints. Advantages which result from it..... 664
5.—Contradictions of Protestants on this point..... 669
6.—Decree of the Council relative to this doctrine..... 670

CHAPTER XXI.

On the laws of the Church, especially those which enjoin fasting and abstinence. *Twenty-fifth Session*.....672—688
1.—On the Legislative Power of the Church, and the use she has made of it..... 672
2.—Of the laws of the Church on Abstinence and Fasting..... 678
3.—Reply to objections against these observances..... 686
4.—Exhortation of the Council on this subject..... 688

CHAPTER XXII

Conclusion..... 689—745
1.—The Reformation, convicted by its own contradictions of having calumniated the Church, undergoes the punishment it wished to inflict on her..... 689
2.—Necessity of professing the known truth, by returning to the external communion of the Catholic Church..... 701
3.—Ceremony of the reconciliation of Heretics with the Church 718
4.—Formula of Profession of Faith extracted from the bull *Injunctum* of Pius IV, with notes compiled from the *Professio fidei* of the faculty of theology at Louvain..... 724

BX 1751 .N2613 1869 SMC

Nampon, Adrien,
1809-1869.
Catholic doctrine as
defined by the Council
AJZ-4750 (ab)